DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 385 SP 006 348

AUTHOR	Taylor, Bob L., Ed.
TITLE	New Dimensions in Teacher Education. The Role of Differentiated Staffing in Teacher Education.
INSTITUTION	Cherry Creek School District 5, Englewood, Colo.; Colorado Univ., Boulder. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Educational Personnel Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Mar 73
NOTE	90p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Differentiated Staffs; *Educational Innovation; *Program Descriptions; *Teacher Education; *Teaching Techniques

ABSTRACT

This monograph reports on the Cherry Creek-University of Colorado Teacher Education Program, which utilized a number of innovations in teacher education and stressed the potential of differentiated staffing in the preparation of teachers. Following the introduction, emphasis is placed on theories of teacher education, the Cherry Creek program, formative evaluation of the program, summative evaluation, the program as experienced by four individuals, and new dimensions in teacher education. Appendixes of related program material are included. (Author/MJM)

ED 075385

NEW DIMENSIONS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

—

The Role of Differentiated Staffing in Teacher Education

by

Bob L. Taylor, Editor

Kenneth L. Husband

L. Stanley Ratliff

Milton W. Schmidt

Cherry Creek School District
Englewood, Colorado

and

University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

SP 006 348

March, 1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

This project was funded by the U. S. Office of Education, Public Law 90-35 (Education Professions Development Act), Title V.

Project Director,

Milton W. Schmidt

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
FOREWORD		iii
CHAPTER		
I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	THEORIES OF TEACHER EDUCATION	5
III	CHERRY CREEK-UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM	11
IV	FORMATIVE EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM	21
V	SUMMATIVE EVALUATION	33
VI	THE PROGRAM AS EXPERIENCED BY FOUR INDIVIDUALS	48
VII	NEW DIMENSIONS IN TEACHER EDUCATION	59
APPENDIX		
A	TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM INVENTORY	67
B	STUDENT ATTITUDE SCALE	70
C	REPORT FORM--COOPERATING TEACHER	74
D	REPORT FROM COOPERATING TEACHERS	76
E	INSTRUCTIONAL AID SELF-REPORT--SENIORS	79
F	TEACHER STATUS REPORT	83

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	OVER-ALL RATINGS OF PROGRAM BY THREE GROUPS OF TEACHERS	22
2.	COMPARISON OF MEANS OF RATINGS OF CHERRY CREEK INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANTS AND CAMPUS-BASED STUDENT TEACHERS	25
3.	COMPARISON OF CHERRY CREEK SENIOR INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANTS AND CONTROL STUDENT TEACHERS ON COOPERATING TEACHER RATINGS	29
4.	WHAT DID YOU DO WITH INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANTS AND INTERNS?	44
5.	DID THE INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANTS AND INTERNS MAKE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE SCHOOL PROGRAM? . . .	44
6.	HOW WELL PREPARED WERE THESE STUDENTS?	45
7.	HOW DID INTERNS COMPARE IN PREPARATION WITH STUDENT TEACHERS WITH WHOM YOU HAVE WORKED? . .	45
8.	WHAT PROBLEMS DID YOU ENCOUNTER WORKING WITH THESE STUDENTS?	45

FOREWORD

This monograph reports on the Cherry Creek-University of Colorado Teacher Education Program. The program utilized a number of innovations in teacher education and stressed the potential of differentiated staffing in the preparation of teachers. Several school districts (Cherry Creek, Adams City, and Denver) were involved with the program, and students from a number of teacher education institutions (University of Colorado, University of Denver, Colorado State University, and University of Northern Colorado) worked in the differentiated staffing plan.

The original project was funded by Public Law 90-35 (Education Professions Development Act) and Cherry Creek School District and the University of Colorado were the sponsoring institutions. Dr. Bob L. Taylor, editor of the monograph and Professor of Education, University of Colorado, was the University Coordinator of the project. Dr. Kenneth L. Husbands, Professor of Education, and Dr. L. Stanley Ratliff, Associate Professor of Education, are Associate Director and Director of Student Teaching, University of Colorado, and had major roles in coordinating the university field experiences of the program. Milton W. Schmidt, Director of Personnel and Staff Development, Cherry Creek School District, was the Project Director and coordinated all the activities of the program in the school districts.

While a final report on the program is presented here, the monograph goes beyond being only just a final report. New dimensions for teacher education were identified in the program and explored under field conditions. These new directions for teacher education are presented here as the primary product of the program.

Bob L. Taylor, Editor
Boulder, Colorado

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

To be blunt about it, some of the major problems of teacher education lie outside the control of teacher educators.[1] First, there is the problem of the liberal arts preparation of the prospective teacher. This makes up about 75 to 85 per cent of the total four-year program. Students emerge from this experience completely indoctrinated in how to teach their subject as demonstrated by the university academic faculty. The truth of the matter is that frequently they have been taught by the traditional lecture, note-taking approach, and the students carry this model with them into the classroom.

A second problem which is more or less out of control of teacher education is the practicum in the public schools. Study after study testifies that the student teaching experience is the single most important experience in the teacher education program. Then why is this a problem? Because, as usually experienced, student teaching has been a severe reality shock, a traumatic experience which brutally inducts the neophyte into the subculture of the school teacher. It has frequently made for mediocrity, since the young person, under great stress, acquires the basic skills for survival in the classroom and refuses to venture beyond these skills for years until the shock has worn off. Then he ignores anything which might have been encountered in professional education, for wasn't the education department responsible for putting him in that survival situation in the first place? His reaction is to turn to the "tried and true" kinds of things which he had witnessed his liberal arts professors use with seeming success.

What can be done about these problems? Most efforts over the last ten to fifteen years have been tinkering with the few professional credit hours which are in the on-campus, teacher education program because we are not in the position to do anything about these other, greater problems. Over a period of time, teacher education in this country has evolved into an established pattern of courses. First, the student took a liberal arts program and a series of courses in his major subject field. Second, during the junior year, he worked in the foundations of education courses such as sociology and psychology of education. Third, the methods of instruction were taught in the junior and senior years either before or concurrently with student teaching. Finally, the student put it all together in the culminating experience of student teaching. It was logical, and it was administerable. Also, large numbers of students could be handled in such a program at minimum expense. On the other hand, it did not work in the manner that a really good professional program should work.

What Is Needed?

How are these problems to be overcome? Certainly, the background in general education and preparation in the teaching fields are not going to be dropped from the program of teacher education. Likewise, the liberal arts faculty is not going to be sent through a remedial teaching improvement program. More creative approaches need to be taken to the problem.

In the extensive tinkering over the last few years, there has developed an agreement upon a group of desirable characteristics for a program which has promise to resolve these plus other problems in teacher education. Students need contact with real school situations early in their university programs. The enthusiasm of the neophyte for contact with real children in a classroom is well known. They need to "select" themselves into teaching based on these experiences. This points to work experience in a school setting with the screening process being carried out over a period of several semesters. It should promote self selection, and it should be reality based. Both public school and university personnel should be in contact with the learner during the entire preparatory period.

There should be close school and university cooperation in the program. The problem of integrating theory with practice has been pointed out in hundreds of articles in professional journals, and this is the strategy for achieving this integration. There must be an extensive and continuous reality base for the program. The students always must be in contact with children and schools.

Students need guidance and assistance from experienced instructors in their preparation for teaching. They must be more thoroughly prepared than in the past. A professional program must include at least a fifth year. Teachers should complete the program with the skills at a professional level and not at just a survival level. The induction process should be gradual so that there is no traumatic reality shock. There needs to be a continuum from preservice to inservice teacher education. One should shade into the other in such a fashion that the transition is hardly noticeable to the teacher.

The program must provide for individual differences. Students must be able to develop at different rates and through different kinds of experiences. While in the preparatory program, they must have experiences at different grade levels and with children of varying socio-economic and racial backgrounds. In addition, they should have some experience with alternative types of educational institutions and know how they operate. Finally, the program should be process oriented so that the student finds flexibility in it and it can make rapid adaptations to individual needs.

Along with these features, the student should move through a series of experiences leading to ever deepening

roles in the learning situation, and together with this the theoretical basis for instruction must be developed. Based on the best judgment of the supervisory personnel involved, the student needs to assume an ever increasing responsibility at a rate as rapid as seems advisable. Also, the student should be able to earn money for his work in the school while he is a learner, for he should be providing a valuable service to the school along with learning about teaching.

A New Approach for Teacher Education

How can these kinds of things be accomplished in teacher education? It is proposed here that these things can be accomplished in teacher education by integrating the preparatory program with a differentiated staffing plan in the schools. The student moves through the positions of instructional assistant, student teacher, intern, and resident teacher during his preparation. Concurrent with this, he is completing his academic work at the university and receiving his theoretical preparation in teaching through the format of a seminar which allows for the individualization of the program for him. The issue of control needs to be worked out with the school district so that it is clear which organization is responsible for what activities and at what point the school district takes over the major responsibility for the teacher's professional development. This should be a smooth transition.

The university personnel who work with students in the differentiated staffing plan will be in much closer contact with real school situations, and the school personnel who are actively involved in the preparation of new teachers will be much more aware of current educational theory and research. The mutual benefits of this arrangement cannot be overemphasized. Since the control of the program is joint between the school district and the university, the personnel will work on a peer basis in this endeavor.

The differentiated staffing plans coupled with a teacher education program should bring into being a new career pattern for teachers, and this should make the profession more attractive to top talent. The senior instructor in the differentiated staffing plan will enjoy greater status, responsibility, and compensation than has previously been true for teachers. Along with being a leader in an instructional group, the senior instructor, in such a plan, would also be a teacher educator; hence, he would have a much greater role in shaping the future of the profession.

This more professional, more comprehensive program of teacher education will bring the new teacher into the teaching role in such a fashion that the pitfalls identified in the introductory paragraphs of this section should be overcome. Through the more gradual, more comprehensive induction experience, the student will be able to shape his own unique potential as a professional; hence, he will not be thrown back on poor models or suffer the desperate rush to crude

survival skills. If teaching is to become the profession it must, then more is needed in the education of teachers than a few disjointed courses scattered through the liberal arts program followed by a few desperate weeks of "sink or swim" student teaching.

References

[1]Wilhelms, Fred T., "Realignments for Teacher Education," in Margaret Linsey (Editor) Teacher Education: Future Directions, Association of Teacher Educators, Washington, D. C., 1970, pp. 5-17.

CHAPTER II

THEORIES OF TEACHER EDUCATION[1]

Teacher education lacks a single, unifying theory. Behind this difficulty and hindering the potential of a theory being developed is the fact that there is no single philosophy of education on which a theory might be based. Also, there is no commonly held position as to what is a good teacher. If there is to be a theory of teacher education, then there needs to be a set of characteristics as to what makes a good teacher. While there is no widely accepted theory, there are any number of proposed theories which are found in the literature. Some of these are: Conant's Academic-Based Theory, Allen's Performance-Based Theory, LaFrone's Conceptual-Scheme Theory, Smith's Three-Component Theory, Combs' Perceptual Theory, and Clark and Beatty's Mental Health Theory.

Academic-Based Theory. In Conant's theory, there were three components. The first one was the broad academic background which was to be developed through high school and the first two years of the university. This included a minimum of 60 semester hours of work in general education and provided the teacher with an adequate breadth of knowledge. The second component was the subject matter specialization. Conant asked for depth in one subject matter field for teachers in grades 7-12. However, he favored certifying K-12 in such fields as foreign languages, art, music, and physical education, and he wanted a minimum of 45 semester hours of work in each single subject field of preparation. Conant's third component was the professional one. He suggested 15 semester hours of preparation in teacher education with only 6 semester hours in classroom work and the remaining 9 semester hours devoted to student teaching. Very important in this plan was the clinical professor who was a member of both a university and a public school faculty. This individual directed the student teaching of the neophytes which in Conant's plan was the heart of the professional preparation. This position stressed extensive academic preparation, for a background in general education was followed by in-depth preparation in a single-subject field. The professional preparation was limited and concentrated on student teaching.

Performance-Based Theory. Allen's theory was based on the premise that prospective teachers should be able to perform specific behaviors upon the completion of their teacher preparation program. The performance-based theory was made up of three conceptual areas--content knowledge, behavioral skills, and humanistic skills. First, specific performance criteria were suggested with respect to content knowledge dealing with general education, subject matter specialization, and organizational and conceptual skills. Second, behavioral skills referred to those teaching techniques which were taught through micro-teaching such as set induction, establishing various frames of reference, achieving closure, and effective

questioning. Teachers are constantly using these skills; hence, they should be proficient in them. Third, in the performance-based theory, was the humanistic skills. No specific performance criteria have been established in this area, but they are needed with respect to personal attributes such as realness, acceptance, and emphatic understanding. The three performance-based areas of this theory implied a hierarchy of areas of competency which are necessary for good teaching: subject matter competency, presentation competency, and professional decision-making competency. While a specific course of study was not suggested in this theory, the competency hierarchy served as a basis on which an institution might design its own performance-based program.

Conceptual-Scheme Theory. The third theory was the conceptual scheme of teacher education of LaGrone. He attempted to provide a rationale for selecting and organizing the preservice, professional content of teacher education. Three assumptions supported this theory. First was the assumption that the prospective teacher, because of previous experience, came to teacher education with certain ideas about teaching and that these ideas existed within some type of conceptual scheme. Second was the assumption that in most instances the ideas and scheme were probably incomplete because the exposure of the individual was limited to a student's perception. The last assumption was that if a media system was developed along with the professional content, the prospective teacher was assisted in developing the most complete conceptual scheme. In this theory, decision making in the classroom was largely influenced by the teacher's concepts of teaching, concepts of the function of the school, concepts of the community setting, and concepts of the child. The professional education curriculum was to give particular attention to the reorganization and extension of the conceptual scheme of teaching which the prospective teacher had already formed. In this theory, five preservice, professional courses were used: Analytical Study of Teaching, Structures and Uses of Knowledge, Concepts of Human Development and Learning, Designs for Teaching-Learning, and Demonstration and Evaluation of Teaching Competencies. The aim was to reorganize and extend the conceptual scheme of teaching which the prospective teacher had already formed. Extensive use of media was to be emphasized throughout each course.

Three Component Theory. In a 1969 AACTE publication, B. Othanel Smith presented a fourth theory of teacher education. Here, the professional program consisted of three interrelated parts: a theoretical component, a teaching-field component, and a training component. In the theoretical component, the basic elements were concepts which were used to interpret what was observed in the classroom in order to solve problems arising in teaching. Hence, a teacher who was theoretically prepared would act with a set of sophisticated concepts taken from the underlying disciplines of pedagogy as well as from the pedagogical field itself. These concepts and their use need to be mastered during the early phases of teacher preparation by studying actual behavioral situations and interpreting them with the concepts which are to be learned and

applied in teaching. This theory required the use of materials providing behavior situations which represented real teaching problems. Two courses were required initially in the college preparation: Teaching Behavior and Non-Classroom Teacher. These courses were to familiarize the student with concepts that he would use in the training component of the program. The second component was the subject-matter preparation made up of two interrelated parts. First, the student needed preparation in his major teaching field. He needed to know how the content might be related to the interests and needs of his students. Seminars were to be used in this preparation with a problem-solving format. The second part of the subject-matter preparation was the command of knowledge about knowledge. Students must know how to talk about subject matter. This required mastery of subject matter. The third component was the training program. This provided practice in using the concepts about teaching which were acquired during the theoretical component. A student should develop these kinds of skills: perform stimulant operations, manipulate different kinds of knowledge, perform reinforcement operations, negotiate personal relations, diagnose student needs and learning difficulties, communicate with students, parents, and others, perform with small and large groups, utilize technological equipment, evaluate student achievement, select appropriate instructional materials. Smith wanted a new training complex. He maintained that the university personnel and facilities were inadequate and that the public schools could not provide the personnel and facilities needed. The staff of this complex was to be mostly elementary and secondary teachers who had the ability to train teachers. They were able to demonstrate techniques of teaching and the use of criteria for the selection of instructional materials. In addition, there were university personnel who were to analyze teaching performance, the behavior of children, and the different forms of knowledge which appeared in teacher-pupil discourse. Upon completion of the training at the complex, the student was to be employed in a public school system as an intern, and then he was to gradually assume the role of a full-time teacher.

Perceptual Theory. The mental health field offers still another theoretical approach to teacher education. Here, the theory focused on the development of the unique personality of each prospective teacher. One such theory was Combs' perceptual theory which described a desirable teacher education program. It was based on the concept of perceptual psychology in which all behavior of a person was the direct result of his field of perception at the moment of his behaving; hence, the behavior of the teacher would be determined by how he learned to see himself and his relationships to his students, his subject matter, and to the profession of teaching itself. According to this theory, teacher education must be concerned with the developing perceptions of the prospective teacher. A number of areas were important in the perceptual organization of a good teacher. He should be well informed, have accurate perceptions about people and their behavior, have accurate perceptions about self, have good perceptions about the purposes and process of learning, and use appropriate

methods of teaching. A teacher education program must concern itself with the above areas. To do this, the program must permit the movement of students at different rates, provide content and experience in response to student needs, provide simultaneous rather than sequential experiences for the learner, and place more responsibility upon the student himself.

This theory of teacher education involved students in three kinds of experiences simultaneously: discovery of personal meaning, exposure to ideas, and involvement in practice. The center of the professional program was a seminar which provided opportunity for continuous exploration and discovery of personal meaning. The content of the seminar was developed out of the needs of students and was affected by their experiences in other phases of the program. Students were to continuously evaluate themselves, and the seminar culminated in the student's decision to undertake an internship. The second kind of experience was aimed at providing information, stimulating thinking, airing controversi , confronting students with professional problems, demonstrating methods and techniques, or giving students opportunities to see and hear persons with important things to say about educational thought and practice. Student involvement in such activities as lecture series, group presentations, workshops, exhibits, and field trips depended on his needs. The experience was to get students actively involved with youth. These activities included: practice teaching, classroom observation, involvement in student groups, involvement in professional affairs, and involvement in educational research.

Mental Health Theory. Another mental health approach to teacher education was developed in the Teacher Education Project conducted at San Francisco State College in the early 1960's. It was based on the premise that a teacher's behavior in the classroom was a function of his personality. In addition, the process of becoming a teacher was one of maturation. Under this theory, the effective teacher was a person who could help students grow into mentally healthy adults who were able to use knowledge and skills to meet their needs in society in socially constructive ways. The teacher education program was to prepare the prospective teacher in the following ways: being broadly knowledgeable, being methodologically equipped, being open to experience, being democratic in belief and action, being helpful in facilitating learning, and being autonomous making. In this program, the important thing was the types of experiences provided by the teacher of teachers. The teacher of teachers was to be a master communicator so that the students felt his positive acceptance of them and his commitment to helping them in any way he could. He was to organize a variety of cooperative procedures in his class so that his students could learn how to plan together. He was to provide sensitivity training so that the student would examine his motivations for becoming a teacher. He was to maintain an individualized and personal relationship with each student. Finally, he was to continually provide new experiences so that the students had the opportunity to back off from what they had done, analyze their

efforts, and choose the next step or change their goals completely.

From the above experiences, it was expected that the students would become more autonomous. It was expected that they would become more self confident about taking risks and the resulting growth in ability to calculate the consequences of an increasing variety of choices. It was expected that the student would increase in self examination realizing that concepts of teaching and self change so must be continuously re-evaluated. It was expected that the student was developing in self acceptance and the resulting recognition of the integrity of self. As a teacher, he was not to try to determine or direct the student's learning but rather to facilitate it. It was expected that the student would develop into a committed teacher.

Summary and Critique

In reviewing these six theories of teacher education, Conant's theory was the most traditional, for it placed emphasis on many hours of course work to provide breadth and depth of subject-matter knowledge. The professional education component was largely limited to student teaching under the direction of a clinical professor. It was assumed that the acquisition of subject-matter knowledge led to effective teaching and that there was no body of knowledge relative to effective teaching.

In the performance-based theory of Allen, the key to successful teaching was the ability to perform specific teaching skills at a required level of perfection upon completion of the teacher training program. Micro-teaching was the primary training method used in this theory to develop the required teaching skills. While the development of specific skills was a needed aspect of teaching, this approach had similarities to the normal school, bag-of-tricks approach to the task of teaching.

On the other hand, La Grone's conceptual theory focused on a broad conceptual scheme about teaching and the necessity of performing specific behaviors upon the completion of each proposed course in the professional program. A teacher would be successful if he had broad and complete concepts about teaching plus the ability to perform specific classroom behaviors at a required level of competence. This approach relied heavily on using audio-visual aids to bring reality to the program. While these can be helpful, it was questionable if they were as effective as the real thing.

Smith's three-component theory combined equally these three components: the theoretical component which was concerned with concept development of the teaching processes and related concerns, teaching field component which stressed subject-matter preparation, and training component which

emphasized critical performance of specific teaching skills. This theory included a new kind of training complex which was to provide the field experience for the neophyte. It was doubtful that there was a need for such an arrangement, for, if the university was willing to work with the schools, these kinds of needed experiences could be adequately provided by the public schools.

The mental health theories stressed the importance of the development of the individual personality of each student. In these theories, since the needs of the students differ, the teacher education program must differ for each individual, not only in rate of progress through the program but in types of experiences necessary for each prospective teacher. It was assumed that a teacher can only know and understand his students if he first knows and understands himself and that these understandings of self and others lead to successful teaching. The program provided for extensive field experiences in real situations. The mental health theories placed emphasis on the affective aspect of the teacher rather than on how many courses he had taken or what competency in performance skills he had demonstrated.

References

[1]Stanbrough, Judith D., "An Evaluative Study of the Professional Education Program as Perceived by Those Beginning Teachers Who Were Prepared to Teach in Secondary Schools and Who Were Graduated from or Recommended for Certification by the University of Colorado During the School Year, 1969-70," Doctoral Dissertation, University of Colorado, 1972, pp. 33-70.

CHAPTER III

CHERRY CREEK- UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

This cooperative venture, calling for a program of teacher preparation and professional induction, began in the fall of 1968 as the product of a Title III, ESEA Planning Grant awarded to the Cherry Creek School District and the University of Colorado. Even though operational funds were not forthcoming in the fall of 1968, the institutions felt the project should begin and both participants contributed time and money in varying amounts. The proposed project was planned to operate for at least three years to permit one group of elementary and secondary teachers to complete the program.

The educational needs and problems, which this program addressed, were of the highest priority because they related to the two major institutions in education (public schools and teacher education institutions) and because they dealt with organizational relationships and educational practices that exert an enormous, and, to date, highly constraining influence on all aspects of education. The major needs and problems this program addressed were:

1. The need for an intimate working partnership between teacher education institutions and operating schools which embodies joint long-range planning, research, invention, evaluation, and demonstration of quality teacher education programs.

2. The need for more highly competent elementary and secondary teachers. Too few of the most capable college students, especially men, select the teaching profession, and too many competent certified teachers drop out of the profession.

3. The inadequate relevance of many present teacher education programs to the real and rapidly changing social and educational problems being faced by schools. These programs fail to link adequately theory with practice and do not provide the student a way to relate and modify continually his program to his unique future needs as a teacher.

4. The inflexibility and resistance-to-change built into traditional concepts and procedural mechanisms of many teacher education programs of teacher certification, and of teaching roles and rigid salary scales in the schools.

Program Objectives

The primary objective of the proposed teacher education program was to improve the quality of elementary and secondary

teaching in Colorado. The program sought to draw a higher caliber of student into the teaching profession, it sought to improve significantly the quality and relevance of the education this student receives, and it sought to effect beneficial change in the institutions that participated in the program. A long-range objective was to have this program serve as a catalytic agent that could stimulate the State's education institutions to innovate, to question traditional solutions, and to effect major cooperatively planned improvements in education. In short, the program sought to infuse a new spirit and desire for improvement and to initiate a realistic process for continuing change. Specific objectives of the program were:

1. To establish teacher preparation and continuing professional development as a continuous cooperative responsibility of both the university and the schools. This means cooperation in the design and long-range planning of both preservice and inservice teacher education programs. It means joint participation in the selection and screening of prospective teachers as well as their education, professional induction, and career certification.

2. To increase the relevance of present teacher education programs to the real and rapidly-changing social and educational problems the prospective teacher must deal with in today's schools. The program seeks to improve teacher competency and break down the artificial barrier between theory and practice by providing prospective teachers extensive laboratory, clinical, and work experiences with multi-age level children, different school environments and districts, many subject and educational task assignments, and a spectrum of community institutions and services that deal with the disadvantaged and with special social problems.

3. To enable schools to develop and evaluate differentiated instructional roles and salary scales. It seeks to develop new and flexible procedural mechanisms and instructional roles through the use of students as instructional assistants, interns, and residents, and the use of experienced teachers as supervisors and instructors of students enrolled in the program. The long-range goal, of which this objective is just the first step, is to develop new organizational patterns, differentiated functional roles, and operating styles within the schools, along the lines that modern industry has found so essential. It seeks to devise ways for the schools to accommodate better teaching positions that vary in responsibility, authority, and function performed.

4. To minimize the wasteful loss of certificated teachers who leave the profession by an earlier and more meaningful joint screening, selection, and induction

process and the provision of more challenging and financially rewarding professional opportunities in the schools.

Program Description

Special aspects of this program which are unique, innovative, or which represent significant improvements on past practices are discussed below. But the total program adds up to something more than the sum of its exemplary parts, and it is this synergistic quality that is the most exciting and potentially powerful force for change in this proposal. Even in its planning, the total concept really excited and stimulated people. It raised their aspirations and their level of expectation concerning how far and how rapidly it is possible to change and improve.

Usually, there are three primary components in a teacher education program: general education, specialized teaching field preparation, and professional education. The Cherry Creek - University of Colorado Teacher Education Program principally was concerned with the professional education features. The other components remained traditional in approach.

The program was aimed at a progressive transition from campus-based academic activities to school-based professional activities over a three-year period. The freshmen and sophomore years remained unchanged as students completed their general education and began emphasis on their teaching fields and areas of concentration. During the third and fourth years, students divided their time between academic work on campus and professional course work and educational field experiences centered in the schools and community. The program culminated in a fifth-year paid internship during which students were enrolled in professional course work and seminars and participated in many educational experiences outside the local school environment.

There were six major aspects which, if not unique, were vital to the program. These six were: (1) the selection process, (2) pay for students throughout the program, (3) development of the role of the instructional assistant, (4) community and special school experiences, (5) school-based professional education courses taught by University and Cherry Creek personnel, and (6) teacher education and differentiated staffing.

THREE-YEAR PROGRAM SEQUENCE

		Fall	Spring
Junior Year 1968-69	Elementary	1. School based I.A.'s T Th 2. Four semester hours-campus based professional education 3. Campus based student MWF	Fall or Spring
	Secondary	1. School based I.A.'s T Th 2. Nine semester hours-school based professional education 3. Campus based student MWF	---------> Fall & Spring --------->
Senior Year 1969-70	Elementary	Fall Campus based student MTWThF	Spring School based I.A.'s MTWThF Ten semester hours-school based professional education
	Secondary	1. School based I.A.'s T Th 2. Twelve semester hours-school based professional education 3. Campus based student MWF	---------> Fall & Spring
Fifth Year 1970-71	Elementary	Fall 1. School based interns-4/5 time 2. Five semester hours-school based professional education 3. Special activities-1/5 time	Spring ---------> Fall & Spring --------->
	Secondary	1. School based interns-4/5 time 2. Five semester hours-school based professional education 3. Special Activities-1/5 time	Fall & Spring --------->

Selection Process. During the spring semester preceding the first fall of the program, a brochure was published and distributed to sophomore students. The publication included a description of the program and an application form. The applications were screened by university personnel for admission to the regular teacher education program based on traditional standards.

In April, a team of faculty members of the Cherry Creek Public Schools was selected to interview eligible candidates. The team, consisting of elementary and secondary teachers, studied the applications and interviewed each candidate on the campus of the University of Colorado. Following the interviews, the Cherry Creek teachers and university faculty members met together and selected and approved students for admission into the program.

The main criteria used in selecting participants were:

A strong commitment to a teaching career and to the participation in and development of new patterns of teacher education.

A high quality academic background in the applicant's high school as well as his freshman and sophomore college years.

Sound physical and mental health, with particular emphasis on the personal characteristics that relate to the applicant's ability to work with people.

Prior experience in activities (e.g., tutoring, counseling, coaching, social service) that gives evidence of the applicant's interest in working with children and his ability to communicate effectively with them.

Pay for Students. Paid work experiences began in the student's junior year and continued through the fifth year. During the junior and senior years, students worked on a part-time basis, averaging two full days per week in those schools participating in the program. In the fifth year, students devoted four-fifths of their time to working as interns. The rest of the time the students were involved in work experience outside the Cherry Creek District.

During the junior and senior years, students earned a total of $1,300.00. The interns were paid $5,450.00 during the fifth-year internship in which students assumed the responsibilities and duties of a regular teacher, but were under the supervision and guidance of a team of experienced teachers as well as the faculty of the University of Colorado.

Role of the Instructional Assistant. The instructional assistant role was an important part of this program. While the role had been defined carefully prior to the first semester of the program, the role gradually was modified in practice. As originally set forth, an instructional assistant was a junior or senior student assigned to a school or

schools on a regular basis where he aided, assisted, and supported school personnel in many instructional, remedial, supervisory, clerical, and housekeeping activities.

While specific work schedules differed for elementary and secondary instructional assistants during the third and fourth years, the nature and scope of the work experience were quite similar. Secondary students, for example, spent two days per week in the schools throughout their junior and senior years, while elementary students served two days per week in the school during the fall semester of their junior year, and five days per week the spring semester of their senior year.

The role of the instructional assistant can be defined best by describing the duties assumed and activities performed.

In both their junior and senior years, instructional assistants spent eight days in the Cherry Creek School District prior to and during the regular fall opening, under the supervision of school and university personnel. This eight-day period included four days of observation and participation in the normal before-school-year program of the regular certified school personnel and the first four days of regular classroom activities in the schools.

Each student in the program was assigned to a teacher or building coordinator and participated in individual classroom, school building, and district-wide beginning-of-the-school-year activities.

Two types of work experiences were scheduled for the instructional assistants during the junior and senior years; the first focused on community services for the disadvantaged, special schools, and children and youth with special problems and are discussed later, and the second focused on teaching techniques and educational programs in the Cherry Creek Schools.

This second type of work experience involved each instructional assistant individually in the educational program of the schools and made him a participant in the teaching process. Each student was under the supervision of an experienced teacher or a team of teachers.

Some of the tasks performed were: leading small groups, helping individual students, preparing units of instruction, meeting with instructional teams, having conferences with supervising teachers, leading informal class discussions, organizing instructional materials, keeping pupil progress charts, assisting in library periods, assisting with independent study, giving remedial help to individual students, preparing daily lesson plans, helping on field trips, and constructing and giving quizzes and tests. While these tasks performed by the instructional assistants were beneficial to teachers, they also helped in the development of the college students as teachers.

In addition to the list of instructional tasks given above, others were: developing bibliographies, preparing bulletin boards, grading papers, operating media equipment, assisting in reading laboratories, assisting with extra-curricular activities, setting up demonstrations, working in Instructional Materials Centers, and making case studies.

The majority of tasks performed by the students were those primarily related to the instructional program. However, many other tasks were clerical, supervisory, or housekeeping in nature. These included such activities as typing dittos, caring for media equipment, and assisting in the office and ordering materials.

School and Other Educational Experiences. Throughout the program, the students, as instructional assistants and interns, were involved in a variety of work experiences with multi-age groups in many school districts, exposed to many community institutions and services that deal with the disadvantaged, and introduced to several private and industrial educational programs. The amount of time and the level of involvement of I.A.'s were determined by the nature of the experience and the estimated value to the instructional assistants. For example, the time varied from one day of discussion with a school counselor to a week of actual work at an outdoor educational laboratory. These experiences were engaged in by students individually, in pairs, or altogether.

The persons, schools, and agencies visited or served were:

Denver Inner-City Schools
U. S. Air Force Academy Learning Center
United Airline Flight Training Center
International Business Machines Corporation
Jefferson County Outdoor Educational Laboratory
Elementary and Secondary Guidance Counselors
Public School Social Workers
J. F. Kennedy School for the Emotionally Disturbed
C. U. Medical Day Care Center
Goodwill Industries
Sheltered Workshop
Morrison School for Girls
Lookout Mountain School for Boys
Headstart Programs
Gold Hill Elementary School (one-room school)
Jamestown Elementary School (two-room school)
Adams City High School
Clear Creek County Secondary School
Antonito Public Schools
Elementary and Secondary Reading Laboratories and Clinics

School-Based Professional Education Courses. Although the specifics of the program differed only slightly for elementary and secondary students, the major diversity was found in the manner in which school-based professional education courses were organized. At the secondary level all instruction in the professional area was conducted through seminars which met two hours a week for the entire year in the school

district where the instructional assistants worked. In the junior year, one seminar was taught by an instructional team in educational psychology and methodology. These instructors drew heavily on the resources of the school district, and both teachers and administrators from the school district were involved in the instruction. High school students were also an important source of instruction. In studying school administration, the seminar met in the administration building and a number of administrators talked about their roles in the administration of the school. When dealing with guidance in the school, the seminar met in the guidance suite and was conducted by the head counselor. Again a seminar on placement involved the district personnel man. In seminars on classroom management and student activities, high school students participated in the meetings and provided the high school student point of view. This kind of instruction made more relevant teacher education.

In the senior year, the special methods work was taught in the school district using both college and school district personnel. The head of the Social Studies Department taught the special methods in that area. A reading teacher from the university rotated her class work among the reading laboratories where the students were working as student assistants so that all were able to see several different laboratory setups. Also, during the senior year, the students had specialized assignments such as social work, guidance, reading clinic, and other duties which gave them a broader and deeper understanding of the functioning of a school system. For a period of six weeks, the students were not involved in the classroom situation, but worked as an assistant to one of the support services personnel of the school. Also, all of them had some experience working with a reading laboratory.

At the elementary level, instructional assistants were enrolled in regularly scheduled campus courses in reading and mathematics during the junior year. Three school-based professional education courses were taught during a six-week period at the beginning of the spring semester of the senior year. Courses in social studies, science, and language arts were taught for periods of two weeks each. Various types of learning activities involved the student for the entire day. Each subject area was taught by two persons, one a university faculty member and the other a curriculum coordinator from the Cherry Creek Schools. The courses were taught in two Cherry Creek elementary schools.

Special efforts were made to combine the theoretical aspects of the courses with "on the spot" application of learning in a real teaching-learning situation. Observation of pupils and the practice teaching of concepts was an important part of the courses.

During the fifth year, the interns were assigned to their schools for four-fifths of their time. The other one-fifth was used in visiting and working in a variety of experiences described in the previous section. University credit was granted for these activities and an evening seminar which was conducted throughout the fifth year.

TEACHER EDUCATION AND DIFFERENTIATED STAFFING

There is a critical need for schools to develop new staffing patterns, differentiated functional roles, and operating styles along the lines that other facets of our society have found so essential and beneficial. There is a need to develop new functional roles which recognize that teachers do differ in terms of their interests, knowledge, and competence. There is a need to devise ways for the educational system to accommodate positions that vary in responsibility, authority, and time required.

In order for teaching to become fully professionalized, it must provide a means whereby the talents and specialization of teachers may be rewarded much more significantly and quickly than current methods of advancing and promoting teachers allow. The typical single-salary pattern must be renovated to provide answers to these nagging problems.

The objective of the plan of differentiated staffing, then, is to develop new personnel designs which will provide the vehicle for modifying the present single-salary concept. Such a plan provides staffing hierarchy based upon broadly defined teaching tasks and responsibilities to accomplish this objective.

The major features of the differentiated staffing patterns in the Cherry Creek School District were:

1. Systems approach to staffing

The program of differentiated staffing provided for a systems approach to school personnel design rather than the former clumsy, uncontrolled, costly, and largely ineffective staffing patterns. It provided for a definitive staffing design based on new requirements as well as a new systems approach to recruiting incumbents to established positions. It provided for a sophisticated professional team composed of a wide range of training and experience assisted by nonprofessional help, trainees, and even high school students.

2. Staffing requirements geared to new student grouping modules

The differentiated staffing models were based on personnel designs geared to modules of 100-150 students instead of the conventional group of 25 students in elementary schools.

3. New career positions

Design models in operation called for six positions on a professional ladder and other supplemental team assistance as seen below:

	Levels	
Professional Ladder	1	Team Leader
	2	Senior Resident
	3	Junior Resident
	4	Team Intern
	5	Instructional Assistants
	6	Student Teachers
Other Team Staffing Positions		Team Aide
		High School Student Assistants
		Volunteer Community Helpers

4. Use of wide range of nonprofessional, high school and community talent

The Cherry Creek program of differentiated staffing introduced the use of nonprofessional paid and volunteer help as well as the systematic use of trained and interested high school students. Most important, it placed a monetary value for their services in the teacher team.

5. Integrated with instructional and staff development philosophy of the school system

The Cherry Creek plan of differentiated staffing furthered the system's commitments and programs in the areas of preservice and inservice staff development. It provided the design around which widely practiced team teaching strategies could be effectively and efficiently organized. Finally, it provided capacity consistent with the system's commitment to individualized instruction.

6. Integrated with new and unique teacher training system

At least four different models of teacher training were incorporated in as many designs for differentiated staffing. The Cherry Creek - University of Colorado Program was one of these models.

One of the major goals of the Cherry Creek - University of Colorado Teacher Education Program was to investigate ways and means by which students in teacher education could be incorporated successfully into the differentiated staffing patterns in operation in the elementary and secondary schools in the Cherry Creek School District.

During the three-year period that one group of students served in Cherry Creek, they all occupied levels of six, five, four on the professional ladder as student teachers, instructional assistants, and interns. These students participated in and carried out the rules and tasks assigned to the various levels. After completion of the intern years, several students were hired as regular classroom teachers and moved into level three as junior residents.

CHAPTER IV

FORMATIVE EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM

There was a formal evaluation conducted of the program during its first two years of operation.[1] The procedures used depended primarily on open-ended and scale-type instruments plus some interview and observational data. The instructional assistants completed a Teacher Preparation Program Inventory (TPPI) and submitted a summary and evaluation report of their activities plus answering several open-ended questions designed to secure an exposition of their major reactions to the program. Also, their logs of activities were helpful since they revealed that they had been used in many ways and had a number of different experiences. The cooperating teachers in the schools were asked to give a report on the quality of the instructional assistants and to report on their promise as teachers. Also, the teachers reported on the operation of the program in their schools.

All cooperating teachers of the instructional assistants were asked to turn in the report mentioned above, and the same form was sent to a group of the cooperating teachers of student teachers in the regular university program. This was done to obtain comparative data so that the performance of the senior instructional assistants and the student teachers in the regular program could be compared. For the secondary program, public school pupil ratings were secured for samples of approximately ten project students and similar ratings were obtained for ten student teachers in the regular university program.

In addition, opinions were solicited from the instructors who taught the professional education courses. Interviews were carried out with supervisory personnel in the Cherry Creek District, and some data were secured for student performance in the regular secondary courses and the students in the Cherry Creek Program.

Evaluation by Cooperating Teacher of the General Program

Teachers were asked to complete a thirteen-item rating form using a five-point scale.[2] In Table 1 are presented the means and standard deviations for the ratings of three groups of teachers. The mean of the Adams City teachers is lower than those of the other two groups of teachers. These teachers worked with the instructional assistants in their junior year at the university. The low standard deviation of the Adams City group indicated uniformity of opinion; these teachers had not been as closely associated with the program as the other two groups of teachers so probably had less independent opinions. While the two Cherry Creek groups of teachers had higher mean scores, the large standard deviations indicated wide differences among the individual opinions of the individuals in the groups.

TABLE 1. OVER-ALL RATINGS OF PROGRAM BY THREE GROUPS OF TEACHERS

Group	Number	Mean	S.D.
Adams City Secondary	5	37.8	4.6
Cherry Creek Secondary	13	40.8	7.2
Cherry Creek Elementary	11	39.9	8.2

Off-Campus Professional Education Courses

In the program, the teacher education courses were all taught off campus on site in the school districts. The instructors of these courses were surveyed by means of an open-end questionnaire. The off-campus courses taught in the school districts provided the opportunity for different activities than on-campus classes, and these opportunities were not always well utilized. One advantage which the off-campus courses had was that the enrollments were much smaller. The faculty members who were surveyed made these observations about the merits of their off-campus instruction:

1. Schools and university cooperated in teacher education.
2. Theory was related to practice.
3. University students worked with real students.
4. There were real examples for class discussion.
5. Small classes made for open, informal instruction.
6. Instructional assistants worked in open space as well as formal classes.

The problems identified by the off-campus instructors were:

1. The two-week instructional blocks in the elementary program were too short and unrealistic.
2. The subject areas in the elementary program were not coordinated. (This same criticism is made of the on-campus instruction.)
3. Many university personnel did not get time or load credit for this off-campus teaching.
4. There was a need for better communication and planning.
5. The logistics of travel and schedules were hindering.
6. Because of small numbers of students, the costs were high.
7. Public schools were not ready and equipped to provide for classes.
8. Public school teachers were not enough involved in the instruction, and they were not paid for their work.

Teacher Preparation Program Inventory

The program evaluator developed a special inventory to measure the expressed opinions and beliefs about professional education, pupils, schools, teaching, and selected practices and problems realted to the profession.3 A comparison of results between the Cherry Creek Program instructional assistants and junior students in the regular university program was made. For the polar pairs used (valuable-worthless, hard-easy, idealistic-practical, relevant-irrelevant, and efficient-inefficient) differences in means as checked by the t test were significant. The Cherry Creek Program students viewed teacher education as more valuable, hard, practical, relevant, and efficient than did their campus counterparts.

The Secondary Program

The data which were gathered for the junior- and senior-year instructional assistants are reported here. No data were collected on the interns in the last years of the program, but follow-up data has been collected.

Junior Year

The students were polled concerning the success of the partnership between the university and the public schools in the program. The instructional assistants agreed that the idea was great, that they were gaining good and realistic learning experiences, and that they were working in different schools, classes, and with pupils with varying social backgrounds. On the other hand, they cited a number of problems:

1. There needed to be a more clear definition of their responsibilities, more supervision, and more visitations by the people in charge.

2. The program needed to be shortened. Students viewed the instructional assistant role as having limited value as a learning experience.

3. The cooperating teachers needed to be carefully selected. Instructional assistants believed that some teachers secured them for their own purposes rather than to assist them with their teacher preparation.

4. There needed to be better coordination between the professional courses and the classroom experiences of the instructional assistants.

5. There needed to be more opportunities for instructional assistants to provide feedback on the program.

With respect to their visits to alternative educational institutions, e.g. IBM, the Air Force Academy, and United Airlines, the participating juniors indicated that the visits had been helpful and interesting but that they were not essential to their teacher preparation. There needed to be more emphasis in these presentations on the objectives of the programs and the problems presented by them.

The experiences which they had had in the program helped them in making decisions about becoming teachers with some students being convinced that they wanted to teach and others deciding that they did not want to teach. The freedom which they were given to try new things depended entirely on the cooperating teacher with whom they were placed, and it varied widely depending on the individuals involved.

These students had a clear idea about what differentiated staffing was; however, their own part in it did not seem to be satisfactory to them. They felt overwhelmed by routine, and they did not feel involved enough in the development of the instructional program with which they were working.

Evaluation of the Junior Instructional Assistants by Cooperating Teachers

The junior instructional assistants were rated by their cooperating teachers at both Adams City and Cherry Creek school districts.[4] The ratings were similar from both systems, and generally the reactions were very positive; however, there were these areas of concern:

1. The students needed to show more warmth and pay more attention to their pupils.
2. The students needed to develop a more professional attitude toward teaching.
3. The students needed to work on their speaking habits.
4. The students needed to be out in the schools full time. The Tuesday-Thursday plan was not a good one.

Comparison of the Evaluation of Senior Instructional Assistants and Regular University Student Teachers

Rating forms were sent to the cooperating teachers of the Cherry Creek senior instructional assistants and to the cooperating teachers of a control group of student teachers in the regular university program. As shown in Table 2, the two groups were comparable with respect to their ratings by the cooperating teachers. The t values indicated no significant difference between the groups.

TABLE 2. COMPARISON OF MEANS OF RATINGS OF CHERRY CREEK INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANTS AND CAMPUS-BASED STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cherry Creek	Control
$\bar{X}$	42.4	43.9
S.D.	6.55	8.3
S^2	42.86	68.29
N	15	11
r = .93	$S.E_m$. = 1.89	t = -.53

In addition, the cooperating teachers did make a number of comments about the program and the instructional assistants:

1. There was not enough time spent continuously in the schools.
2. The student's role as an instructional assistant was not clearly enough defined.
3. The total time spent in the program might be shortened.
4. The social studies students needed broader subject-matter preparation.
5. There was disagreement over assigning instructional assistants to individual teachers vs. instructional teams.
6. There were variables with different instructional assistants and different cooperating teachers with respect to expectations about the program.
7. The students needed to develop a more professional outlook and more professional behavior.

Evaluation of Instructional Assistants by High School Pupils

The cooperating teachers surveyed the pupils from the classes where the instructional assistants had been working with a Student Attitude Scale. This scale asked the pupil to express agreement or disagreement with a number of statements. These evaluations were compared with an established set of ratings from earlier research which used the instrument. There was no significant difference between the ratings of the control and the experimental group.

Self Report by Senior Instructional Assistants

The instructional assistants were requested to complete a multiple-choice-type instrument to which they added a number of comments of their own.[5] The responses to this instrument were very positive with several recommendations for changes. Student suggestions included:

1. There was a need for more innovative work in their classes.
2. Grading needed to be based on discussion and activity rather than on tests based on textbooks.
3. Part of the work, especially in psychology, needed to be based on field experience.
4. Professors needed more time for visiting classes so that the course work would be more relevant to the students.
5. Courses needed to be offered on an eight-week basis.

Reading Course Experience

During the second semester of the senior year, the secondary instructional assistants took a reading class. Along with their class work, they were assigned to work in several schools doing work which could be integrated with the theoretical course work. They tutored students, worked with a new reading program, taught in a remedial reading program, did diagnostic testing for perceptual defects, and worked with pupils in a counseling relationship. Data on this activity came from pretest and post-test responses, logs of activities, reports on reading, teacher evaluation forms, and self reports. The primary findings were:

1. The instructional assistants were very supportive of the reading course.
2. The instructional assistants' experiences varied widely, and some were much more involved than others.
3. The in-school situations varied with respect to equipment, attitude of faculty, and reasons for assigning pupils to the remedial reading classes.
4. The instructional assistants found that the pupils read poorly for several reasons, e.g. lack of motivation, physical and perceptual handicaps, and poor reading techniques.
5. The instructional assistants found that pupils want to do better when someone displays an interest in them.
6. It was discovered that many practical things which were not in the curriculum stimulated pupils to want to read.

7. It was learned that some pupils did not read in class because they were embarrassed.

8. The instructional assistants learned much in this experience by discovery.

Independent Field Experiences

In this program, an opportunity was presented for each student to make a decision about how he would spend his time for approximately eight weeks. This came late in the program after they had completed their course work and had had a number of in-school experiences. Two students studied the counseling and social work that was done in the upper elementary grades. Another studied the work being carried on at a rehabilitation laboratory with special attention to the relationship of the laboratory and the schools. Two instructional assistants were interested in the problem of the perceptually handicapped and spent time working with these pupils in elementary schools. One student worked at a headstart center studying the operation and its relationship to the schools. In addition, he learned at first hand about the frustrations, values, and aspirations of minority children. One student used this time to study various high school operations, curricula, facilities, and teaching procedures. The students believed that this experience gave them better insight into the problems of pupils, helped them to decide how to work with pupils, and gave them a better understanding of the social background of pupils.

Elementary Program

The evaluation of the elementary part of the program followed the same approach as the secondary, but there were some data which were not collected for this part of the project, e.g. pupil evaluations of student teachers.

Activities of Juniors in the Elementary Program

These students reported their activities in a log. They worked in open classrooms, resource centers, and individualized instruction. They did the usual type of instructional assistant work in locating library materials, planning lessons, giving tests, supervising students, preparing bulletin boards, lunchroom duty, and checking folders. Also, they had a number of out-of-class activities, e.g. field trip to inner city school, field trip to Jefferson County Outdoor Education Laboratory, field trip to Day Care Center, visit to school psychologist, interview with social worker, and visits to junior high schools. There were several suggestions which came from the logs:

1. Pupils needed to be involved and doing things.

2. The instructional assistants wanted to be involved in activities and not to be just observers.

3. The instructional assistants were gaining insights into children.

4. The instructional assistants found it valuable to be part of a planning group.

Juniors' Responses to Open-Ended Questions

In responding to the open-ended instrument, there were a number of strengths and weaknesses identified. The following strengths were cited by these students:

1. Instructional assistants had a real and diverse set of experiences.

2. This approach to teacher education stressed practicality.

3. The instructional assistants were exposed to a variety of educational philosophies.

4. The program helped to build the confidence of persons who were hesitant to become teachers.

5. It gave insight into and experience with personality conflict.

6. The experiences recalled some very valuable childhood experiences.

Also, there were several weaknesses cited:

1. There was too much to do.

2. Student did not learn enough about the community itself.

3. The communication between everyone involved in the program needed to be improved.

4. There needed to be more meetings between the instructional assistants and the administration.

5. Teachers needed to learn how to use the instructional assistants.

6. Students needed more experience in ghetto schools.

Other comments about the program were:

1. There was a great deal of variation in how the instructional assistants were used and in the help they received from their cooperating teachers.

2. The experiences as instructional assistants did strengthen their commitment to becoming teachers.

3. There was freedom and the opportunity to explore and try new ideas.

4. The students had gained knowledge of the differentiated staffing plan.

Evaluation of Junior Instructional Assistants by Cooperating Teachers

The cooperating teachers were very positive in their ratings. The teachers expressed the common criticism that the instructional assistants were not there long enough. Also, they indicated that they had not had enough help in learning how to use them. Finally, the teachers indicated a lack of understanding with respect to the purposes and philosophy of the program.

Evaluation of Senior Instructional Assistants by Cooperating Teachers

This evaluation was made of ratings and comments by the cooperating teachers and a comparison made with the ratings of a sample of elementary student teachers in the regular teacher education program at the university. The results of this comparison are presented in Table 3. On a 65-point scale, the mean rating of the Cherry Creek group was 51 with a standard deviation of 11.9. The control group had a mean rating of 40.1 with a standard deviation of 11.7. A statistical test gave a t value which was not quite significant, but it was encouragingly close to the 10 per cent level of confidence.

TABLE 3. COMPARISON OF CHERRY CREEK SENIOR INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANTS AND CONTROL STUDENT TEACHERS ON COOPERATING TEACHER RATINGS

Teacher Ratings	Cherry Creek	Control
N	6	10
$\bar{X}$	51.0	40.1
S.D.	11.9	11.7

Estimated reliability of measure .95 $t = 1.62$ favoring Cherry Creek

The idea was expressed that the instructional assistants should complete the equivalent of student teaching in the senior year since they were going to be taking over regular teacher responsibilities in the intern year. Also, the problem of communication was cited again. In the comparison with student teachers from the regular program, the senior instructional assistants compared very favorably.

Self Reports of Senior Instructional Assistants

The section was based on the responses of the elementary seniors to multiple-choice and open-ended instruments. All of the students were looking forward to their year of internship. These students rated their competence in visual aids as poor. Also, they rated their seminar experience as poor. In general, the students indicated that the program had met its commitments to them. In evaluating the methods courses taught in the district, they were consistent. They highly rated the language arts course, were favorable to the science course, and were neutral on the social studies course. They had these suggestions to offer:

1. The school district classrooms and pupils needed to be used as laboratory situations to make the courses realistic.

2. The courses needed to involve cooperative planning and instruction by district and university personnel.

3. The courses needed to be presented over a longer period of time, e.g. 4 to 8 weeks.

4. There needed to be better communication among the university, school district, and students.

5. Students were concerned over the reduced salary for the intern year.

6. There was a need for a seminar where there was an ongoing evaluation of progress and an adjustment made to take care of problems that occurred.

Summary and Conclusions

1. The project had been successful in preparing teachers. The data indicated that these students were potentially superior teachers.

2. Based on the opinion of the participants in the project, it operated very satisfactorily. In the secondary program, the reading class, the opportunity for independent selection of some work, and the various opportunities for work with school pupils were major strengths. For the elementary program, experience with children, the use of classrooms and children in education courses, and experience in open-type classrooms were rated high.

3. The program took a long period of time. There was widespread belief that the program should be shortened in length.

4. There was variation in the acceptance of the program. Cooperating teachers varied from strong support to open hostility.

5. Communication remained a problem in the program. A number of things were tried, and, while the problem improved, university personnel needed to spend considerable time in the district. Seminars for discussing the problems and performance of the instructional assistants needed to be set up and used.

6. The instructional assistants found that participation and involvement were more beneficial than observation.

7. The roles of the instructional assistants and cooperating teachers were not clearly enough defined. Because of this, a certain amount of conflict existed in the project.

8. While the instructional assistants were paid for their work, there was controversy as to whether they were being "used" by the district. The reduced pay for interns was a major source of controversy.

9. The potential of the program for preparing teachers was not fully realized. The education courses taught in the district failed to utilize the available resources, e.g. pupils, instructional materials, and school personnel, adequately in the instruction.

10. The cooperation between the school district and the university in the preparation of teachers needed greater development.

11. The recruiting procedures were not successful in all respects. The financial aspect did not seem to figure in recruiting prospective teachers. Also, some of the instructional assistants' attitudes were found lacking by the cooperating teachers. Finally, the program did not attract more men into teaching.

12. The program did not develop a positive image in the university or the school district. The fact that it failed to attract large numbers of applicants even though it provided an entree into one of the top districts of the state raised serious questions about its impact.

13. Because of the low teacher-student ratios in the program, the problem of cost was important. A cost analysis was not done, but it was questionable if such a program could be financed on a regular basis.

14. Not all instructional assistants had experience within a differentiated staffing pattern. Assignment of instructional assistants to teams must be done with the approval of the team members.

References

[1]Anderson, Harold M., and Daniel J. Bauman, "An Interim Evaluation of the Cherry Creek Teacher Education Project After the First Year of Operation," Mimeograph, August, 1969.

"An Evaluation of the Second Year of Operation of the Cherry Creek--C.U. Teacher Education Project," Mimeograph, August 7, 1970.

[2]Appendix D, Report from Cooperating Teacher

[3]Appendix A, Teacher Preparation Program Inventory

[4]Appendix C, Report Form--Cooperating Teachers

[5]Appendix E, Instructional Aid Self Report

CHAPTER V

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION

This chapter reports on two follow-up evaluations of the program which were conducted with students and teachers who had been involved with it. First, a follow-up survey was carried out with the former students from the program. This survey was made after the participants had been employed in regular teaching positions. Second, follow-up interviews were conducted with teachers in the Cherry Creek School District who had worked in the program with the students.

Summary of Student Questionnaires

A follow-up questionnaire survey of all the students who had participated in the program was conducted.[1] The questionnaire was structured in two parts. The first part included questions designed to assess the participants' viewpoints on a variety of their experiences. Responses to these questions were recorded on a five-point scale: (A) Strong Agreement, (B) Agreement, (C) Disagreement, (D) Strong Disagreement, (E) Not Applicable. The second part of the instrument included five open-ended questions soliciting written comments. The questions asked for comments on strengths, weaknesses, suggestions for improvement of the program, and why a student remained in the program or did not remain in it. The students' statements are included in this report as a part of the commentary following each item.

The questionnaires were mailed to 38 former students who had been involved in the program. These 38 people included those who had dropped out of the program as well as those who finished it. There were returns from 23, or 60 per cent of the individuals polled.

An item-by-item report on the responses to the questionnaire is presented here. In reporting the data, SA stands for Strong Agreement, A for Agreement, D for Disagreement, and SD for Strong Disagreement. NA stands for Not Applicable. Those respondents who dropped out of the program did not participate in some parts of it and thus have responded to certain items as being Not Applicable.

1. Starting as instructional assistants in the school was an appropriate activity for the beginning of the program.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
13 (56%)	9 (39%)	-	-	1 (4%)

The respondents agreed (95%) that the idea of starting out as an instructional assistant was a good way to begin. The strong endorsement for the instructional assistant role was important since it was a new and untried role in the program.

2. Five years was too long for the program.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
4 (17%)	3 (13%)	6 (26%)	3 (13%)	7 (30%)

One continuing concern was the fact that students in the traditional teacher education program could complete teacher certification in four years whereas the participants had to complete five years of work before they were eligible for certification. Even so, less than one-third (30%) of the respondents felt that the program was too long.

3. Participation in the program made me more able to approach faculty members.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
9 (39%)	9 (39%)	4 (17%)	-	1 (4%)

Presumably, getting to know faculty members is a desirable goal. For these respondents, this was not a major problem since more than three-fourths of them (78%) indicated that participation in the program made it easier to approach faculty members.

4. As a result of the teacher education experience, I had less fear of failure in the practical side of teaching.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
14 (60%)	5 (21%)	2 (8%)	-	2 (8%)

Although many students of teaching are reluctant to discuss their fears of failure, this tends to be a problem of considerable importance. One goal of the program was to provide the participants with sufficient learning experiences in both theoretical and practical situations so that fears of failure would be alleviated. Eighty-one per cent of those responding agreed that their fear of failure was reduced as a result of their teacher education experiences.

5. I found the whole experience uncomfortable.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
1 (4%)	1 (4%)	7 (30%)	12 (52%)	2 (8%)

The possibility that some of the students who participated in the program might find the whole experience uncomfortable was raised. Those responding to the question did not seem to share this view, for only 2 (8%) indicated that they felt uncomfortable in the experience.

6. Theoretical courses taught on site at the school district were meaningful.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
1 (4%)	12 (52%)	7 (30%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)

The program had as one of its assumptions that theoretical courses taught at the school district site would be more meaningful than campus courses. While more than half of the respondents did agree that the on-site courses were more valuable than campus courses, it is important to note that 38% felt that the on-site courses were not meaningful. One student stated that the classes were too formal and did not have enough practical ideas while another stated that the professors in the program were excellent.

7. My experience in the schools met my expectations.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
5 (21%)	13 (55%)	5 (21%)	1 (4%)	-

Since a major thrust of the program was an emphasis on field experiences, it was important to determine if experiences in the schools met the expectations of the students. Three-fourths of the respondents indicated their experiences met their expectations.

8. Similar programs should be valuable for most future teachers.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
15 (65%)	6 (26%)	-	1 (4%)	1 (4%)

Contrary to the occasional negative feelings expressed by the respondents, it is interesting to note that they felt almost unanimously (91%) that a program similar to this would be valuable for most future teachers.

9. My relations with teachers in the program were rewarding.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
14 (60%)	7 (30%)	2 (8%)	-	-

Research in the area of student field experiences is replete with the importance of the student's relationship with the cooperating public school teacher. The respondents were nearly unanimous (90%) in their belief that their relations with teachers in the program were rewarding.

10. As an instructional assistant, travel to the public school was a major problem.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
2 (8%)	3 (13%)	12 (52%)	5 (21%)	1 (4%)

The setting for the program was in the Denver metropolitan area. Some participants were provided with university cars while others provided their own transportation. Nearly three-fourths (73%) of the respondents did not regard travel to the schools where they were working as a major problem. One comment, however, did indicate that travel time was a problem.

11. As an intern, travel to the public school was a major problem.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
-	3 (13%)	9 (39%)	7 (30%)	4 (17%)

When the results of items 10 and 11 are compared, traveling to their schools seemed to be more of a problem for interns than for instructional assistants. Actually, the interns were going to the schools every day while the instructional assistants in the case of the secondary schools were in the schools only two days a week. This may account for the difference in the responses.

12. Isolation from the university faculty and facilities was a detriment.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
1 (4%)	4 (17%)	11 (47%)	7 (30%)	-

Part of the rationale for maintaining campus-based teacher education programs is that the students, if centered off campus, would miss the cultural advantages of the campus community. Respondents in the program apparently did not share this viewpoint, for more than three-fourths (77%) indicated that isolation from the university faculty and facilities was not a detriment.

13. I really missed the extracurricular activities of the campus.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
1 (4%)	3 (13%)	8 (34%)	8 (34%)	3 (13%)

In harmony with their responses to the previous question, less than one-fifth (17%) of the respondents indicated they really missed the extracurricular activities of the campus.

14. The selection process for the program, which involved interviews with Cherry Creek School District teachers and staff, was a good approach.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
5 (21%)	15 (65%)	-	1 (4%)	2 (8%)

Admission interviews for the program were conducted primarily by school district personnel, and in most cases by teachers with whom the participants would be working at one time or another. University faculty members sat in on the interviews, but the major responsibility was that of the public school personnel. The respondents apparently were impressed with the admission procedures, for 86% indicated that they approved of the interviews with school district personnel.

15. The inclusion of Cherry Creek School District teachers and staff members in the teaching of professional education courses was an important part of the program.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
6 (26%)	10 (43%)	1 (4%)	2 (8%)	4 (17%)

The idea of involving public school personnel in the teaching of the professional education courses was an effort to blend the practical experience of teachers with the more theoretical approach of university faculty members. A large majority (69%) of the respondents agreed that including public school teachers and staff members in the teaching of professional education courses was an important part of the program. "More and longer practical course work with involvement in schools" was suggested by one student.

16. Visits to educational agencies and institutions such as the Air Force Academy, Jefferson County School District Outdoor Lab, and United Airlines were worth the time taken away from regular classroom assignments.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
10 (43%)	8 (34%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	2 (8%)

A great deal of time, expense, and effort were spent in arranging a variety of field experiences for the program participants. In addition, the participants had to leave their regular teaching assignments and substitutes were hired to take their places. When asked whether all the effort, expenditure, and interruption of routine was worth it, more than three-fourths (77%) of the respondents indicated that it was. One student stated that he stayed in the program because there was a greater variety of experiences than in the usual teacher education program.

17. My role as an instructional assistant in the Cherry Creek School District differentiated staffing pattern was well defined.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
2 (8%)	8 (34%)	6 (26%)	6 (26%)	1 (4%)

At the time the program got under way, the differentiated staffing concept was relatively new to both public school and university faculty members. It was not, therefore, surprising

that more than half of the respondents, who were undergraduate university students, indicated their roles as instructional assistants in differentiated staffing were not well defined. "There was a problem of job definition, vague definition of the role of the instructional assistant, and a lack of definitions of roles and program."

18. My role as an intern in the Cherry Creek School District differentiated staffing pattern was well defined.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
2 (8%)	7 (30%)	4 (17%)	6 (26%)	4 (17%)

When asked the same question about how well defined their roles were as interns in the differentiated staffing pattern, the response was similar to the previous item. The major difference in responses between the two items was between the Not Applicable category which was attributable to the students who dropped out and actually did not participate in the internship. "The role of the intern was not definite. There was a vagueness in the difference between an intern and a teacher." This comment was made by one of the respondents. Another respondent wrote, "Careful safeguards in the manner in which school districts utilize interns should be instituted."

19. My understanding of "what I was getting into" was as good as could be expected of a beginner.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
4 (17%)	14 (60%)	3 (13%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)

The feeling of being fairly well informed about a new and experimental program and of becoming a part of the program is especially important due to the unknowns involved. Even though half of the instructional assistants and interns who responded indicated that they felt their roles in differentiated staffing were not well defined, slightly more than three-fourths (77%) felt that they had as good an understanding of the program as could be expected of beginners.

20. The time spent in the school districts other than Cherry Creek as an instructional assistant was valuable.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
11 (47%)	5 (21%)	2 (8%)	-	5 (21%)

Another major dimension of the program was accomplished through the provision for experiences in lower socio-economic school districts. When asked if they thought that the time spent working in the alternate school districts was worth while, 68% thought that it was valuable.

21. The ability to earn money while still in training was the primary purpose of my entrance into the program.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
2 (8%)	2 (8%)	13 (56%)	6 (26%)	-

The ability to earn money while still a student was theorized to be one of the attractive features of the program. When asked if the money was, in fact, the primary purpose for entering the program, 82% indicated that it was not. One student commented that the money paid her made her self supporting while earning her certificate and she felt that she was learning while earning.

22. Having three years of experience in the Cherry Creek School District helped me in being considered for a job in the district.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
6 (26%)	6 (26%)	1 (4%)	3 (13%)	6 (26%)

Prior to being admitted to the program, students were informed that participation in the program in no way obligated the school district to employ them. In spite of this admonition, it was natural that job expectations developed since the students were involved as instructional assistants and interns in the district for three years. However, when asked if they thought the three years spent in the district helped them in being considered for a job, only 46% indicated that it did. One student said, "The program helped me to become known in the district and thus helped the possibility of getting hired." Four of the interns disagreed, and one commented that the school district promised more than it gave, especially with respect to job opportunities after the program.

23. Completion of the program made it easier for me to obtain a teaching job than those students who completed the traditional four-year program.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
11 (43%)	3 (13%)	-	3 (13%)	6 (26%)

A major assumption of the program was that those students who completed it would have relatively little difficulty in obtaining a teaching job. When the participants were asked if they agreed with this assumption, only three (13%) of those who responded disagreed. Twenty-six per cent indicated the question was not applicable since they did not seek a job or did not complete the program.

24. The time spent at other grade levels than the one at which I planned to teach was valuable.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
10 (43%)	7 (30%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	4 (17%)

The program was planned not only to provide participants with a variety of experiences in alternative school districts and institutions, but also at different grade levels. While all students did not work at different grade levels, nearly three-fourths (73%) of the respondents agreed the experience was valuable.

25. Inservice education through workshops, regular course work, and other professional growth activities should be continued the year after the internship.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
3 (13%)	8 (34%)	2 (8%)	4 (17%)	5 (21%)

During the three years the students participated in the program, they were involved in professional growth activities each semester including inservice courses, professional education courses, and professional meetings. When asked if they thought the professional growth activities should be continued after the internship was completed, nearly half (47%) of those responding agreed that the activities should be continued. One student commented, "Inservice courses could have been better planned and more helpful--they have lots more potential."

26. The relationships developed between teachers and interns were helpful.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
9 (39%)	9 (39%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	3 (13%)

In view of the relatively long-term field commitment which was a part of each participant's experience, the relationships they developed with teachers were especially significant. Of the respondents, 78% indicated that their relationships with teachers were helpful. Among those who felt the relations were helpful was one student who commented, "Evaluations from master teachers were helpful as well as the exposure to a variety of educational philosophies. It was helpful to work with 'alive' teachers who always were seeking to improve their own teaching."

27. The relationships I developed with school district administrators were helpful.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
5 (21%)	10 (43%)	3 (13%)	1 (4%)	4 (17%)

While the relationships with the school administrators were not nearly as frequent as those with the teachers, good participant-administrator relationships were necessary. From the respondents, 64% indicated these relationships were good.

28. The tempering of the "reality shock" by entering the profession through the instructional assistant-intern route was helpful.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
14 (60%)	6 (26%)	1 (4%)	2 (8%)	-

"Reality shock" is a phenomenon experienced by first-year teachers who find the practical, everyday challenges of the classroom to be significantly different from what they expected as a result of their teacher preparation experiences. When asked if they felt the reality shock was tempered by virtue of their having worked as instructional assistants and interns, 86% of the respondents indicated that they thought it had been.

29. Cherry Creek School District personnel were interested in my thinking about the program.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
5 (21%)	14 (60%)	3 (13%)	1 (4%)	-

In harmony with responses to previous related questions concerning good relationships, 81% of the respondents indicated they thought the school district personnel were interested in their thinking about the program.

30. University faculty members were interested in my thinking about the program.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
6 (26%)	13 (56%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	2 (8%)

A final inquiry concerning relationships revealed that the participants held a strong positive feeling about their relationships with university faculty members. From those responding, 82% indicated they thought that the faculty members were interested in their thinking about the program.

31. The program was sufficiently flexible to meet my individual needs.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
8 (34%)	9 (39%)	1 (4%)	4 (17%)	1 (4%)

To a student, flexibility generally means that when unforeseen personal or program difficulties arise, matters are worked out smoothly by program administrators. An example of program flexibility occurred when one of the interns became ill and had to miss one of the week-long, field experiences. After recovering from her illness, she made arrangements on her own for a similar experience. When asked if they thought the program was sufficiently flexible to meet their individual needs, nearly three-fourths (73%) indicated it did.

32. The payment for my services as an instructional assistant was adequate.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
4 (17%)	14 (60%)	2 (8%)	-	1 (4%)

Response to item 21 indicated clearly that the primary purpose for entering the program was not the money paid for services. A related question was whether the money they were paid was adequate for the services rendered to the school district. More than three-fourths (77%) of those responding felt they were adequately compensated for their services.

33. The payment for my services as an intern was adequate.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
4 (17%)	8 (34%)	3 (13%)	2 (8%)	4 (17%)

Payment for services as an intern was based on the regular beginning teachers' salary schedule less $1,300.00. Since the interns had all the classroom responsibilities of a beginning teacher, there was some feeling that they should have been paid the beginning salary even though they had agreed to work for the lesser amount and were released one-fifth time for teacher training purposes. Only half of the interns felt that payment for their work was adequate.

34. When I entered the program, I understood the provisions under which I would be paid.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
8 (34%)	13 (56%)	2 (8%)	-	-

Even though a substantial number of the program participants (21% of the interns and 8% of the instructional assistants) felt the money paid to them was not adequate, almost all of them (90%) indicated that they understood the provisions under which they would be paid.

35. I felt secure in terms of the way teachers with whom I worked interpreted my job as an instructional assistant.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
3 (13%)	10 (43%)	4 (17%)	5 (21%)	1 (4%)

Inasmuch as the role of the instructional assistants was not only new to the students but also to the teachers with whom they were working, there was a question as to how well the role was understood. Some lack of understanding of the new role was reflected in that more than one-third (37%) of the respondents indicated that they did not feel secure in the way the teachers with whom they worked interpreted their jobs.

36. I felt secure in terms of the way teachers with whom I worked interpreted my job as an intern.

SA	A	D	SD	NA
3 (13%)	4 (17%)	7 (30%)	4 (17%)	4 (17%)

The role of the intern in the differentiated staffing pattern also was new to both the interns and the teachers who worked with them. The interns reflected the relative lack of understanding of their roles when nearly half (47%) of those who responded indicated that they were insecure in the way the teachers with whom they worked interpreted their jobs. "There was a kind of inferiority complex or feeling of resentment on the part of some interns." Another respondent stated, "The title of intern should be changed to part-time teacher."

Summary of Teacher Interviews

During the spring semester of the year following the end of the program, 19 Cherry Creek teachers who had supervised University of Colorado students were interviewed. Of the 19 teachers interviewed, 12 had worked with both instructional assistants and interns, 4 had supervised only instructional assistants, and 3 had worked only with interns.

The interviews were conducted by a Cherry Creek teacher in person or by telephone. Each of those interviewed was asked the following questions:

1. What did you do with instructional assistants and interns?
2. Did the instructional assistants and interns make contributions to the school program?
3. How well prepared were these students?
4. How did interns compare in preparation with student teachers with whom you have worked?
5. What problems did you encounter working with these students?

The questions and the nature, length, and variety of the responses made it impractical to report each interview in detail. The analysis which follows consists of a series of tables which include a categorical report of each response and a qualitative summary of each which reveals the "flavor" of the responses. It will be noted that all those interviewed did not respond to all questions and some answered questions more fully than others. Therefore, the number of responses to each question varies.

TABLE 4. WHAT DID YOU DO WITH INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANTS AND INTERNS?

Categories	Instructional Assistants	Interns
Work with individuals	8	1
Work with small groups	4	-
Little or no teaching	1	-
Some or much teaching	4	12
Observed mainly	1	-
Work as aide (clerical)	2	1
Grade papers, locate materials, etc.	7	-
Full responsibility	1	7
Involved in all school activities	-	3

An inspection of Table 4 reveals that there was a definite shift in the type of activities engaged in by the instructional assistant and the intern. The shift from outside or peripheral classroom activities during the instructional assistant years to classroom instructional activities as interns is clearly shown. Each one interviewed who supervised an intern commented that his intern either was responsible for areas of teaching or was fully responsible for classes or sections of classes.

TABLE 5. DID THE INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANTS AND INTERNS MAKE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE SCHOOL PROGRAM?

Categories	Instructional Assistants	Interns
No	-	1
Yes, but not significantly	4	3
Yes	7	3
Yes, very definitely	2	6

As shown in Table 5, teachers felt the contributions made to the school program by interns were somewhat more valuable and extensive than those made by instructional assistants. The most frequently reported reason for a lower level of contribution of instructional assistants was the shorter period of time spent in Cherry Creek schools as compared to the time spent by interns. It might be noted that the only intern who was rated as having made no contribution dropped out of the program early.

TABLE 6. HOW WELL PREPARED WERE THESE STUDENTS?

Categories	Instructional Assistants	Interns
Poorly	-	-
Not well	1	2
Adequately	6	5
Very well	3	5
Excellently	1	2

As presented in Table 6, examination of the responses to this question in the transcribed interviews revealed no definite patterns. Each person interviewed gave a unique or personal reason for his answer. The teachers, as a whole, felt that both instructional assistants and interns were in general well prepared.

TABLE 7. HOW DID INTERNS COMPARE IN PREPARATION WITH STUDENT TEACHERS WITH WHOM YOU HAVE WORKED?

Categories	Interns
Not as good	2
About the same	-
Better or much better	10
No comparison made	6

As presented in Table 7, the responses to this question revealed clearly that most of those teachers who had worked with student teachers previously felt that the interns were to some extent better than students in a regular student teaching situation.

TABLE 8. WHAT PROBLEMS DID YOU ENCOUNTER WORKING WITH THESE STUDENTS?

Categories	
Lack of dedication or interest	2
Lack of direction from authorities	4
Students here too short a time	2
Lack of follow-up	1
No major problem	8
No comment	2

As shown in Table 8, approximately one-half of the teachers who responded to this question felt that there were no problems of great significance. At the same time, however, four teachers felt that there was a lack of direction and communication between and among students, university personnel, and Cherry Creek teachers.

Conclusions

From the analysis of the data collected through the questionnaire and interview follow-up surveys, some conclusions were reached with respect to the program. Some of the conclusions based on the data collected from the former participants who now have hindsight do not agree with those reached from the formative evaluation of the program. Perhaps, the participants have a new perspective, or, perhaps, the problems were corrected by the program staff once they were identified in the on-going evaluations. These conclusions were drawn from the data collected in follow-up surveys:

1. The results of the questionnaire and interview follow-up surveys leave a definite positive impression concerning the program. While problems were identified, the support for the program by the former participants was strong.

2. Positive human relations with teachers, administrators, university faculty members, and fellow participants were identified as a strength of the program. This was an unexpected outcome since earlier evaluations had pointed to human relations and communication as problem areas.

3. There was support for integrating teacher education with a differentiated staffing plan. This positive response was not anticipated, for originally there had been problems with poorly defined roles within the differentiated staffing plan; however, the participants now seemed to have gained a better understanding of their roles within the plan and the potential of the plan for the preparation of teachers.

4. While there was a positive reaction to moving the teacher education program to on-site instruction, it was not as strong as anticipated. Professional education courses, meetings, inservice projects, and seminars were all held off campus, but the change of site did not seem to alter the nature of the instructional activities enough toward reality.

5. The former participants were very positive about the variety of field experiences. While this proved to be an expensive and time-consuming effort, these experiences were viewed as the most significant part of the program.

6. The longer period of preparation seemed to make for a better prepared teacher candidate. The responses of the teachers who were interviewed indicated that the interns handled more teaching tasks better than the usual student teacher.

7. There was evidence of good university and school cooperation in such things as using school personnel in the instructional program and the involvement of teachers in the admission process. Nevertheless, the responses of the teachers indicated that there was need for even greater improvement here.

8. The program was individualized and personalized in a very successful fashion. The former participants indicated that their personal needs had been well provided for by the program.

References

[1]Appendix F, Teacher Status Report

CHAPTER VI

THE PROGRAM AS EXPERIENCED BY FOUR INDIVIDUALS

As a means for providing a more personal report on the students who participated in the program, a series of structured interviews was conducted. The number of interviews was limited since only those students who had completed one year of teaching beyond their status as interns were used. The four following descriptions include two secondary-level participants and two elementary. The secondary teachers include an English and a Social Studies teacher.

No claim is made that the persons selected for the interviews are typical or that they represent a cross section of the group. It is hoped, however, that the individual viewpoints of the persons selected will portray the flavor of the program--at least from the viewpoints of these individuals.

In order to report the interviews with openness and at the same time avoid being directly critical of individuals and institutions, the names of both persons and places have been changed.

Mary

A secondary education student majoring in social studies, Mary did not get a job in the district where she did her internship (more about this later). She did get a job as a junior high school social studies teacher in a county school district approximately 25 miles from Denver.

Mary could be characterized as intelligent, 26 years old, married, no children, and genuinely interested in becoming a good teacher. She was not motivated by the ability to earn money during the time she was preparing to become a teacher. In addition, she did not feel that five years was too long to spend in a teacher preparation program. She is now enrolled in a graduate program at the University of Colorado.

Mary came into the program from the Denver Center of the University where she found out about the program. She was recruited in the beginning teacher education class, Social Foundations of Education. The director of the program, Mr. Jones, came to the class, described it, answered questions, and asked interested students to get in touch with him. As a result of this, Mary contacted Mr. Jones and was asked to come in for an interview.

The interview process for Mary was a significant experience. She felt from the outset that she was no longer just another student, with an IBM card and a student number, but an individual who was being looked over for possible entrance into a selective program. During the interview she felt Mr. Jones

asked relevant questions that helped determine if a candidate had potential for success in the program. Mary left the interview feeling very enthusiastic about the program and her possibilities of being included in it. Mary corroborated her interview comments on a questionnaire submitted to all program participants. In summary, the selection process was, in Mary's opinion, very successful--it made her feel as though she were an individual of some importance in a large university.

The importance of Mary's feelings about the program became more evident when she described her views on the other students selected to participate in the program. She viewed nearly all of them as being intelligent, hard working individuals who were really trying to do the best they could. The nature of the program tended to elevate the level of commitment. Mary singled out only one person who was, in her opinion, a misfit. This particular student, according to Mary, should not have been admitted because she simply did not like children! She suggested that some means of weeding out students other than self elimination should have been built into the program. For the most part, however, Mary felt that those who did complete the program "really knew they wanted to become teachers" and also had enough different experiences to know the kinds of people "you wanted to teach with as well as the kind you don't."

Among the innovations included in the program that Mary felt the most positive about was the teaching of professional education courses at the school district site. Being able to take classes in the same building where she was working was convenient as well as worth while for Mary. She also appreciated the small classes and the possibility of discussing incidents and ideas that were actually taking place in the classrooms where she was working during the school day. In addition, she was appreciative of the opportunity to get to know her university professors who were aware of and sensitive to the problems in her teaching situation. Mary was not impressed with the school district faculty member who taught one of her methods courses. She felt he did not have time to prepare for the class inasmuch as he was carrying a regular teaching load with the district. She indicated he was so involved in other things that the teaching of a professional education course was not important to him.

On the other hand, Mary felt her educational psychology course, which was taught by the school district psychologist, was a valuable experience. He demanded a great deal, considering the teaching loads carried by the interns, but Mary stressed that she did get "a few things that I could use in the classroom, and that is important to me." A seminar and another methods course were also valuable to Mary who was impressed by the practical thrust of the courses taught at the school district site.

The variety of field experiences seemed to be the most significant part of the program to Mary. Being exposed to teachers and students in several different school districts

enabled her to make comparisons that were valuable to her. The experience of administering reading tests to 8th-grade Chicano students in southwestern Colorado gave her valuable insight into reading problems of minority students which are seldom viewed by social studies teachers. Her empathy for students was expressed most clearly when she described the situation in one of the districts involved in the program. "I really felt sorry for the kids, sorry for the teachers, sorry for the whole district. There were no areas of interest for the kids--no wonder they have such a terrific dropout rate. I would drop out, too, if I were a kid in that situation."

The role of "instructional assistant" was new to university students. Supervision of students in this role was also new to teachers. The plan was to phase the instructional assistants into the instructional responsibilities over a period of two years until, by the beginning of the third year when they were interns, they would be ready and able to function as classroom teachers. By and large, Mary followed the plan and indicated that she functioned essentially as a teacher's aide during the first year, i.e. grading papers, running off materials. During the second year, she was involved in additional teaching tasks, and, during the third year, "my role changed completely--I was a teacher, and I had the same responsibilities as a teacher. I was responsible for what I taught. There was a radical difference between being an instructional assistant and an intern."

"Immediately and violently!" was Mary's comment when asked how the district teachers' association reacted to her in her role as an instructional assistant and especially as an intern. There was a general suspicion that the interns were being trained to replace teachers. Whether the teachers chose not to try to understand the program because it threatened them or whether they felt threatened simply because they did not understand is not clear. The fact that there was misunderstanding and that the interns and instructional assistants felt pressure due to the misunderstanding was one facet of the program not anticipated by its planners.

Mary's views on the potential of integrating differentiated staffing and teacher education were enlightening. She indicated in the previous paragraph that there was much apprehension about interns and instructional assistants in the program schools, yet, apparently because of her training in differentiated staffing and understanding of it, she indicated she presently teaches with the help of teacher aides and would welcome interns in her building.

Mary's reaction to the planned dinner meetings of instructional assistants and interns, teachers, professors, and the Director of the program was enthusiastic. The interns and instructional assistants had a great deal in common and the meetings gave them an opportunity to share experiences. "We had kind of eating-rap sessions and they were more than just good, they were really important."

A threatening dimension in the program to the interns was the fact that the district made no commitment about being obligated to hire them once their internship was completed. They were told repeatedly that there was no obligation on the district's part to hire them. Even so, the single most disappointing aspect of the three years which Mary spent in training was the fact that she was not hired by the district where she did her internship.

Betty

As a secondary English major who was genuinely interested in working with youth, the program seemed almost tailor-made for Betty. Her strong positive attitude toward children, as well as adults, was instrumental in her being able to attain a teaching job in the district where she did her internship. As a mother of three and being thirty-five years old, Betty knew what she was looking for in her preparation to become a teacher, and the program apparently met these needs. Since completing her internship--less than two years--she has completed her M.A. degree and is now a Ph.D. candidate.

The ability to earn money while still in training did not particularly attract her to the program; nor was she dissuaded by the additional year beyond the usual certification program required of program participants. Betty and Mary were enrolled in the same beginning teacher education course, at the Denver Center of the University of Colorado, when Betty first heard about the program from Mr. Jones, the program Director. The interview was conducted by Mr. Brown, the head of the English department in one of the district's secondary schools. Betty's reaction to the interview was predictably enthusiastic. She felt she was being treated as a "VIP" in an important program. Betty viewed the interviews as a practical way to discern her capabilities for becoming a student in the program. Nevertheless, it was more than two months before she was officially notified that she had been accepted. This delay caused considerable apprehension for Betty as well as other students interviewed since it hindered their ability to make plans for the approaching school year.

Betty's view of the students selected for the program was that they were a highly individualistic group, with each student entering the program for different reasons. She felt that commitment to the program, in spite of the inevitable frustrations, made the difference between those who stayed in and those who dropped out.

The opportunity to take the professional education courses on site was a particular strength of the program in Betty's view. "Probably the nicest thing about the whole idea (on-site education courses) was the fact that we had a chance to make them real--we didn't do anything, or at least very few things, that we weren't able to use immediately--and most of our assignments were given to us in terms of things we could do in the classrooms where we were working."

The variety of field experiences built into the program was, from Betty's viewpoint, a primary strength. For example, the reaction to being placed in a low socio-economic school district to work was generally one of disappointment on the part of most of the interns. Betty viewed the assignment as a challenge for being able to accept the experience as it came along and to make the best of it was a challenge. In order to provide a broad scope of field experiences for the program participants, it was necessary for them frequently to be absent from their home district. Even though there were funds available to hire substitutes, there was a potential problem in view of the building principal's desire to have his staff on duty as much as possible. Betty believed, "The idea of being able to spend a week in another school--having an experience like this was worth whatever sacrifices we had to make in terms of public relations with our principal or parents."

Betty utilized an interesting means of dealing with potential critics of the program. She recognized very early that most of the criticism was coming from teachers who were suspicious of the program because they didn't understand it. "I developed my own technique of going into a new experience and doing a kind of selling job for the program before the rumors got started--and the people were very nice to me and I had a lot of good experiences and worked with a lot of good teachers." There were concerns expressed by the teachers' association concerning the status of the interns and the nature of the entire differentiated staffing plan. While these concerns were never expressed officially or in writing, they were real and were felt in one way or another by all the interns, including Betty. She felt the teachers were fearful that differentiated staffing was being forced upon them, and, since they were not able to reach the administrators, the teachers showed their frustrations through their negative feelings toward the interns. Betty felt that as an individual she was liked by the teachers with whom she worked, but that as an "intern" she was not accepted by them.

In addition, Betty observed that neither she nor her fellow interns fully understood all the implications--especially the negative ones--of being a part of a differentiated staffing program. Betty saw herself as a different type of aide working in the classroom. The full awareness of what it meant to be a part of a differentiated staffing program and all the negative teacher attitudes was not realized until the students were well into the second year of the program.

A frequently heard criticism of the use of interns was that they are turned loose--given full, or nearly full, teaching loads and received little or no help from the university or the public schools. This was not the case with Betty, for her perception of the help she received from the university and her cooperating teacher was that it was more than adequate. She did not feel that she was being exploited as "cheap labor." Whether or not an intern received adequate supervision or compensation probably was not nearly as important as how the intern <u>felt</u> about the supervision and compensation.

Since differentiated staffing had taken on controversial overtones with the teachers, the means of communication among the persons involved was especially important. One of the most effective devices was social get-togethers of interns, teachers, administrators, and university faculty members. Many of these were small gatherings that served to squelch rumors and build the sometimes sagging morale of the interns.

The program called for the interns to work primarily in the parent school district and, although each intern was informed on different occasions, obtaining a job in the district naturally became one of the primary expectations of the interns. Since Betty accepted a job in the parent district, it is understandable that she had positive feelings about the way interns were treated by the district in terms of job opportunity. It is important to note, however, that the interns who did not get jobs in the district felt very disappointed since they had worked in the district for three years.

When asked to summarize the strengths of the program, Betty named the variety of field experiences first. Not only did the field experiences give her a chance to see various schools in operation, but it was an opportunity to work with different groups of students. Also, she felt exceptionally well prepared to accept her teaching responsibilities as an intern after working two years as an instructional assistant. The second area of strength mentioned was the teaching of professional education courses at the school district site. She said, "It was a chance to do something real about what we were learning in the education courses."

Improvement of communication was mentioned by Betty as a means of improving the program. A corollary to this was the need for participants to have a better understanding of the program at the point of entry. Betty felt that some of the students came into the program without strong commitment to it and were, therefore, easily frustrated and discouraged when problems came up.

One purpose of the program was to launch interns into graduate programs by offering graduate level credit to them during their fifth year. Betty was able to gain experience in secondary reading in which she developed an interest and is now a graduate student in secondary reading. She attributed this motivation to her opportunities for working with reading teachers in different schools which was a part of the varied field experiences.

Susan

Susan, an elementary education student, attended school in Denver where she graduated from George Washington High School. She wanted to attend a large University and chose the University of Colorado because she wanted to stay in the State.

Age 20, single, a striking appearance, and an affable personality were all positive factors in her successful completion of the program. At the time she entered the program, she was on the verge of dropping out of teacher education because she felt the traditional program was too structured.

Susan heard about the program in one of the beginning elementary education classes on the Boulder campus. The program appealed to her because she had some misgivings about the regular one. She felt it was ideal for her because it took her out of the traditional program at a time when she wanted out. It also provided her with a small amount of money while she was in school, and she needed the money at the time. Finally, the prospect of spending five instead of four years in preparing to be a teacher was of little concern to her. She felt she could learn a great deal more about teaching by becoming a part of this program in lieu of doing her student teaching under one cooperating teacher in a self-contained classroom.

Susan was interviewed for the program by a school district staff member. In contrast to the views of other interns concerning the value of the interview, she was not impressed by it. When pressed as to why she felt this way, Susan indicated, "I don't think they really found out much about us. They did not ask very good questions."

Even though she had a negative reaction to the interviews, Susan was impressed with the quality of the students who were selected for the program.

The general impression which Susan held of the program was that it was excellent. It provided her with the opportunity to work with children over an extended period of time which enabled her to decide if she really wanted to become a teacher. Such things as working closely with a science teacher who demonstrated a lesson in science to a class and then being able to take a small group from the class and try out the demonstrated method were excellent.

Having the opportunity to student teach a full semester instead of eight weeks was another highlight of the program in Susan's opinion. Also, Susan found the internship to be a rewarding experience. She stated, "I had a lot of teachers around me on whom I could call--so I did not have to make my own mistakes."

When queried as to the value of the education courses that were taught at the school district site, Susan had a positive reaction and said, "We could determine if a method of teaching science or language arts was worth while by trying it out almost immediately with real children." The course that impressed Susan the most was the language arts methods which was taught by a team composed of a professor from the University and a school district staff member. She commented, "It was valuable to me in that it helped me in learning to work with children and how to teach language arts." The educational psychology course and the student teaching seminar did not impress her.

The field experiences Susan participated in included Headstart, a child day-care center, visits to urban elementary schools, a week-long visit to an economically deprived rural school made up of minority group children, and another week-long experience working in an outdoor laboratory school. This variety of field experiences had a profound effect on Susan and in her words were "very, very valuable." She was doing her internship in a suburban school with open space and team teaching when she took a week to visit and work in a poverty-stricken rural district with a predominance of minority students. "We could compare the open space school to a self-contained classroom school. We could compare our children with those children, and we learned a great deal from this." The week of teaching at the outdoor lab gave Susan insights into new approaches to teaching science. She concluded, "I wish I could take my children there (to the lab) now, for I liked it so very much."

There is little question as to the value of the variety of field experiences enjoyed by the instructional assistants and interns. However, this portion of the program was not without unique problems. Being gone for several days, sometimes a week at a time, produced a gap in continuity at the home school which could not be avoided. Susan commented, "It was very hard to leave my team and my children for a week. On one occasion, I left when we were changing schedules, so I left my team hanging." Even so, Susan indicated that the team did not resent her being gone because they understood the field experiences to be a part of the program.

Susan was well aware of the change in responsibilities from instructional assistant, which emphasized teacher aide type duties, to that of a student teacher, which included an emphasis on instruction, and to the internship where she functioned as part of a teaching team. As an instructional assistant, Susan had clerical work to do which she did not like. Her desire, even as an instructional assistant, was to work directly with children, and she was not happy with anything less than that. The semester of student teaching was a growing experience for Susan. She learned "a lot about my children, myself, and a lot about teaching." As an intern, Susan felt she really developed into a teacher. She worked in the same building pod and on the same team as when she was a student teacher. The continuity of the experience helped her gain confidence and to be accepted by her fellow teachers as an equal member of the team. As a first-year teacher in the same school, Susan's self concept was one of confidence and competence.

When asked to contrast the university and the school district in terms of the quality of the supervision which she received, the university came out second best. She stated, "I was treated fine by the school district and by the elementary school as an intern. I was treated good by the university, but I did not get as much help as I think I could have had. I think that since there was only a small number of us, the supervisor could have known us better."

In summarizing the strengths and weaknesses of the program, Susan stressed the value of the variety of field experiences, the semester-long student teaching with an outstanding cooperating teacher, and her internship, because "I was with a fantastic team." Susan stated as weaknesses the lack of supervision from the university and the failure of students and university personnel to take full advantage of the learning possibilities in seminars and small on-site classes.

Jean

Jean is an attractive, intelligent, 25-year old, who is now married (but single while in the program). She had wanted to be an elementary teacher as long as she could remember, and to meet her objective she chose the University of Colorado over several other schools that had accepted her. While not presently teaching, Jean is working as a curriculum evaluator in a curriculum development project. She chose to enter the program because she heard it was to be a highly selective group and the program was to be a new approach to teacher education. Jean did not fully understand the commitment she was making in terms of the length of the program; however, this did not seem to concern her. Jean's first concrete impressions of the program came from a brochure which she was given in her first professional education course.

The admission interview impressed Jean more than any other early experience in the program. The interview was conducted by a school district staff member who was teaching in one of the elementary schools. Jean left the interview feeling very excited about the program and wanting very much to be accepted. Jean indicated that one of the reasons she was so excited about it was that the teacher who interviewed her also was very positive about it.

Being involved with students at the beginning of the program and having the opportunity to work in a variety of schools were the strengths of the program according to Jean. The opportunity to immediately test and apply the ideas learned in methods courses was another plus factor in the program. Jean felt the opportunity to use new materials with students instead of talking about them was an asset. For example, she felt successful in the science methods course, even though she experienced frustration with some aspects of it. By working through the problems right in the classroom, she was able to adapt the course to her needs. "We had a chance to experience what the kids were going through right at the time."

When asked to compare the value of courses taken on site and on campus, Jean favored the on-site courses. For example, the math methods course was taught on campus, and even though she learned how to use Cuisenaire Rods, she felt she still did not know how pupils would react to them.

Predictably, Jean felt very positive about the cooperation and support she received from the school district personnel involved in the program. Her reaction to the question of how well she was accepted was almost one of surprise. She expected to be accepted, and, in her words, "In all cases my experiences with all the people involved were very cooperative, were very positive, and they all helped me in whatever way I needed. They were willing to accept what I had to say right off the bat which I thought was really neat."

"The more varied the experiences, the better," was Jean's response to the question about the value of the variety of experiences provided each intern in the program. The opportunities to visit schools with different economic classes of children and to observe different modes of teaching were particularly valuable to Jean. "You found you had an opportunity to decide where you wanted to teach and where you best fit. You weren't locked into an upper-middle-class school or a lower-class situation."

Jean's perception of her role change from that of an instructional assistant to an intern showed considerable insight. As an instructional assistant, she saw herself in the role of a helper-observer who was getting to know the classroom and the students and getting accustomed to the idea of becoming a teacher. During the second semester of her instructional assistant experience, she saw her role changing as she was given responsibility to plan, teach, and evaluate her own units. This was part of a gradual process of gaining more confidence in learning to work with children so that by the time she was an intern there was no problem in taking over the responsibility of a classroom.

The experience of being a part of a teaching team was especially valuable to Jean. She felt from the beginning, even when she was "just a peon," that her ideas were accepted by the team. Jean did not remain in the "peon role" for very long. Even though she was a junior member of a team that had a definite differentiated staffing hierarchy, she became involved in many of the team leader activities, such as curriculum development and attending meetings to represent the team. She agreed that the program's goal of integrating differentiated staffing with teacher education was a success in her case with one exception--she felt she had all the responsibilities of a first-year teacher but was called an intern and paid a lower salary.

One goal of the program was to provide interns with adequate assistance and supervision. Jean felt that the help she received from both the university and the public school personnel was reasonable. She said, "If I needed help, there always were people willing to give me help, not only in the school but in the university, which was nice."

Another program goal was to get the interns together socially to help build morale and a sense of togetherness. Jean felt the social gatherings were very useful as they helped her find out about the program and the people in it.

One of the areas of misunderstanding experienced by some of the interns was the commitment the school district had to them with respect to a job. Jean had no question in her mind about the fact that interns weren't guaranteed jobs. "I knew after the internship that I was on my own."

When asked to consider the weaknesses of the program, Jean felt the methods courses were not arranged to take full advantage of the on-site, teaching situation. She did say, however, that as the program progressed, she saw substantial changes in the courses that did take advantage of the on-site, teaching situation. She felt that it might have helped if the teachers who taught the methods courses had been given special training in how to take advantage of the site and having children with whom to work.

The high point of the program for Jean was the human relationships. All the interns kept in touch with each other, and she felt the school district and university personnel were very close to her.

Another goal of the program was that the participants would aspire to going on with their professional development in the form of challenging jobs or graduate work. Jean's experiences with individualized instruction on a teaching team proved to be invaluable in obtaining two curriculum development positions--one in math and one in science. She stated, "It wasn't so much my background in math that got me my job as my background in individualization. I knew how to handle individualized materials and, at that time, they had no one else who knew how in that part of New York." Jean subsequently moved around, but soon returned to Colorado for a job. At this writing, she is working in the B.S.C.S. project evaluating new curriculum materials.

CHAPTER VII

NEW DIMENSIONS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

What is needed to provide the neophyte teacher the kind of teacher education program which will make him a true professional? In this report, an exploratory program was described and evaluated, and from this investigation a number of dimensions for a professional program were identified. Here, differentiated staffing was used to provide the vehicle for integrating theory and practice in such a fashion that genuine school-university cooperation was realized.

What are the new dimensions of this proposed program of teacher education? Prior to presenting and elaborating on these dimensions, two basic assumptions need to be stated. First, with reference to the theories of teacher education developed in the second chapter of this monograph, the program focused on individualization; hence, it is on the mental health end of the continuum as opposed to a stress on subject matter end.

Second, there is no perfect model to fit all teacher education situations; hence, the dimensions of the proposed program are presented without reference to any specific model. There is no attempt to spell out the details of a model program since programs must be organized to fit the unique problems of local situations. The actual administration and organization of a program must vary from situation to situation.

New Dimensions

What are the characteristics of a professional program? These characteristics are presented here and explained in some detail.

Selection of Students

The success of any education enterprise is dependent, in large measure, upon the quality of the learners who are involved; likewise, the effectiveness of a teacher education program is determined, to some degree, by the qualifications of the participants in the program. Therefore, the selection and retention process should be based upon a set of well-developed criteria.

Institutions of higher learning do not have complete control over the type of students who enter their programs; however, many have been unwilling or reluctant to develop and apply selection and retention criteria. Beyond institutional academic standards, there are at least three facets of the selection process which are important to its success.

First, some form of commitment from students should be required for admission to the program. Thus, self selection should be a part of the process. These commitments are not roadblocks to prevent students from entering the program, but rather a test to determine if these students are sincerely interested in becoming teachers. The commitments might include an extra year of professional work beyond the usual four-year undergraduate program, extra duties and responsibilities in the public schools, or assignment to service agencies prior to or during the program.

Second, school personnel with whom students work and learn in a school-based teacher education program should have a part in the screening and selection process. This screening process may take various forms, but public school teachers and administrators should have a choice in the selection of prospective teachers.

Third, the final selection criteria should be a joint venture among students, university faculties, and public school personnel. The mechanics of the final selection process will vary with the characteristics of the institution of higher learning and the public schools involved.

An adequate retention policy and its administration are almost as important as a sound selection procedure. A series of evaluation check points should be set up throughout the teacher education program, and a formal evaluation should take place at the end of each major segment of the program. Retention in the program should be based upon the joint evaluation of student teachers (self evaluation), teachers, administrators, and university personnel.

Involvement of Public School Teachers

Since a program of this type requires a great deal of teacher cooperation, it is necessary to involve them from the outset. Certainly, the teachers who will be working with the students should be involved in their selection for the program. By enlisting the teachers in the selection of the participants, they have a stake in the program from the start. The teachers are not merely consulted, but they have the final decision as to who enters the program at their school.

During the period of time in which the neophyte is working in the school, primary responsibility for his supervision falls upon the team of teachers; hence, the teachers should be involved in the evaluation of the students. One of the conditions under which a teacher agrees to work in the program is that he will submit regular, written evaluations on the performance of the student with whom he is working.

Along with the above responsibilities, teachers should be part of the instructional team in professional education. The level of involvement may vary from the teacher having the entire responsibility for a course to participating in a seminar meeting as a resource person. One reason that teachers

are able to participate is that the professional education work is offered on site at the school making it easy for the teachers to attend the seminars and work with the students.

School District-University Cooperation

As stated earlier, one of the weakest aspects of teacher preparation has been the lack of valid school district-university cooperation in the total effort of preparing teachers. While there has always been some cooperation, it has not been the kind of effective relationship that really benefits the student and the teacher. Meaningful cooperation requires joint planning. Too often, the university has done its planning without consulting the school district personnel who are to be involved. Joint planning means to design a program of teacher preparation with all members of the educational community participating in the venture.

If planning is done jointly, then there should be a shared use of personnel. This means that university staff would be more actively involved in school district operations, and, of course, school district personnel are used in more relevant and meaningful teaching or consulting work on the university campus with prospective teachers. Likewise, if personnel are to be shared, then the next step is joint use of facilities. In other words, many courses taught now on campus could be presented on site in the school, and the research facilities of the campus are more available to the school district.

Any serious attempt to move toward school district-university cooperation would require a review of the financing arrangements for the two institutions. The shared use of personnel and facilities would need to be reflected in budget planning. This, perhaps, would be the most difficult problem of all.

Field-Based Professional Education Courses

The work in professional education should be taught out in the schools where there are real resources available for instruction. Instruction is conducted in school instructional materials centers as well as in campus curriculum laboratories. When classes are presented at the school site, pupils, teachers, administrators, plus other specialized school personnel, are at hand to be part of the instruction. In presenting the administrative structure of a school system, an administrator from the system may explain the operation of that district to the students in the school board meeting room.

Certainly, there are problems in using schools as sites for instruction. Many schools do not have well-equipped instructional materials centers so there are not adequate materials available. Also, it is difficult to bring a large enough group of students together in one place to make it practical.

There are constant conflicts with school-scheduled uses of facilities. Since students have many commitments, it is difficult to maintain communication and to bring them together. Probably, the advantages of on-site classes still outweigh the disadvantages because of the reality of the situation.

Alternative Educational Experiences

There is an extensive array of state, private, business and military educational agencies which can provide the student with new dimensions of the educational process. In each case, arrangements to study these must be made well in advance to get students involved at the necessary depth to really understand the operation. Students do need to leave their regular duties at the schools in order to participate in these activities. This can produce conflicts of interest for the student so that careful preparation with the school personnel needs to be carried out to secure their cooperation.

Advantages of these activities are many. The students are given a new experience, and they are brought together to discuss something out of the school setting. They gain perspective and fresh insights into their own situations from the experiences. Seeing the educational process carried on in another kind of environment provides the student with a new basis of comparison of his own class activities.

Differentiated Staffing

Differentiated staffing has great potential as a means for introducing neophytes into the profession. The concept calls for several levels of personnel with different degrees of skill who are working together in an instructional team. This provides an opportunity to work students into real teaching situations as paid employees of the district while they learn. Starting as instructional assistants, the students progress to student teachers, to interns, and then to probationary teachers as their skills and preparation increase. It is a realistic way to prepare teachers.

By the same token, it brings the veteran teachers into the role of teacher educators, for they, as team leaders and members, take an extensive responsibility for the preparation of these students in real classroom situations. These people need inservice work to prepare them for this new role. Also, in this role, they will cooperate with university professors in the instruction of the neophytes in the theoretical aspects of teaching. This plan goes far beyond the apprenticeship approach to teacher preparation. Students do have on-the-job, practical experience over a period of time, but, also, on site they are provided with needed instruction in theory by university instructors and experienced teachers.

The instructional assistant is a new role in teacher education. This person is a university student who, as part

of his teacher education program, is working as an assistant to a public school teacher prior to his student teaching. While the tasks performed by the instructional assistant should be beneficial to the cooperating teacher, they should also have value for the development of the university student as a teacher.

Experiences in a Variety of School Settings

Students going into teaching need a variety of experiences in their preparation. Today's teacher will encounter many different types of teaching situations in the course of a career. In their preparation they must have experience with different grade levels and social and ethnic groups; hence, a program needs to provide a variety of experiences. Teachers should have some initial experiences at two or three different grade levels to determine what level seems to be best suited for them. Also, to prepare to work in the schools of a pluralistic society, they need to work in schools where they encounter children from different ethnic and social backgrounds. Along with this, there must be accompanying instruction which assists them to gain a better understanding of people from these diverse backgrounds. This type of experience requires that a university maintain training centers in several different school districts in order to give their students the variety of experiences which are needed.

Continuity from Preservice to Inservice

If there is no such thing as a completely educated teacher, then the granting of a degree and a certificate certainly is not the termination of a professional teacher's education. In order to make this truism real, the wall dividing preservice from inservice education must be eliminated. The student entering on a career in education needs to understand that he is only receiving his basic preparation. His education as a teacher does not end when he is granted his initial certificate. This continuation of his preparation is not limited to formal college training by way of advanced degrees, for there are many other kinds of educational experiences important to the growth of a teacher.

Frequently, school districts have failed here by simply requiring teachers to go back to the university and take more courses. The other extreme is the district which has a series of repetitive workshops that do not offer much academic challenge to the teachers. What is needed is the promulgating of an attitude on the part of teachers to continue to grow both as educators and as people.

Climate Development

The climate of the teacher education program is of great importance. An open, accepting, supporting kind of classroom climate is needed in the public school classrooms. In order

to attain this type of classroom climate, students need to experience it in their preparation for teaching. This means that this type of climate must exist among the students, teachers, and faculty in the teacher education program. The program must have the kind of flexibility which meets the individual needs of students. The student must have a part in decision making about his own learning experiences.

The development of this kind of climate in the program means a great deal of effort must be put into maintaining communication. There should be opportunities for large group meetings, for small groups holding informal discussions with professors and teachers, for conferences among students, teachers, and professors. Efforts should be made to develop close relationships between the people involved in the program. This calls for informal meetings, parties, and meetings where ideas and problems are discussed in depth by those who are concerned. Nothing will substitute for a mentally healthy climate in the program.

Reality Shock

The need for early and varied field experiences in teacher education has long been recognized; however, the value of these experiences is no longer questioned and more and more programs are providing field experiences for students. Because the induction of the neophyte into the subculture of the school is frequently traumatic, it is desirable for the prospective teacher to experience this reality shock in a preservice situation where the experience is less traumatic and more controlled. The teacher education program must introduce the prospective teacher to the real world of the school and the profession, and it must actively involve the students with youth from various social and economic backgrounds. If prospective teachers are to understand the broad spectrum of the school, they must experience contrasting school situations: preschool, elementary, secondary, public, private, industrial, military, inner city, suburban, and rural. An experience with a community service agency can provide the student with the needed activities to help ease the "reality shock."

Feedback and Program Flexibility

A program of this kind is in need of constant feedback from many sources. Informal student sessions provide insight into needed changes. Formal conferences with cooperating teachers provide clues. Social gatherings such as dinner parties and student outings give a feel for things. If the program is to succeed, it must respond to problems rapidly as they arise. The people involved need to talk things out, and those in decision roles must be able to act quickly. Constant and accurate feedback are a must if the program is to display the flexibility to keep it viable.

Financial Remuneration

The student in teacher education should be able to earn as he learns. He should go to work in a school system as an instructional assistant for so many hours a week. This establishes his position in the differentiated staffing plan, and it makes him part of a real instructional team. A fifth-year internship with pay moves the student into another kind of position in the staffing plan. The student is not placed on full salary since part of his time will be occupied with directed experiences in the preservice programs. If the district hires the student, he moves into the role of the probationary teacher, and he is on full salary. At this point, his preparation shifts to inservice activities; nevertheless, this plan calls for the student receiving pay for his work in the school throughout his period of preparation.

Individualization of Instruction

In the proposed program, individualization of instruction is to be emphasized. This is to be accomplished in a number of ways. Seminars are small enough that instructors can tailor the work to fit the expressed needs of the student. Both university and school personnel spend time working on an individual basis with the student through conferences and clinical experiences. The student is guided through a variety of field experiences so as to help him identify the type and level of teaching situation to which he is best suited. The close personal contact and the extended period of preparation through a fifth-year internship makes it an expensive program. True individualization requires the extensive use of time from well-prepared faculty members. This is the kind of preparation which is needed for a professional program.

Expanded Professional Program

How long does it take to educate a professional teacher? There was a time in our history when an eighth-grade education was considered adequate, and it is only within recent years that a four-year college degree has become standard for certification. Nevertheless, for a person to enter teaching at a truly professional level of expertise, there is considerable agreement that it is going to take still more preparation. Fifth-year and five-year plans have become popular, but it is the position of these writers that a professional teacher needs more extensive preparation than that. This is particularly true if the neophyte is working for pay in a differentiated staffing plan during most of his preparation. Here, it is proposed that preservice work shade into inservice work so that it is all part of a single preparatory program. Also, if the preparatory program is extended and if the level of expertise at the time of final entry as a full-fledged member of the profession is raised, there will be introduced a much more extensive self-selection process. It will no longer be a matter of taking three or four extra courses for a certificate while getting an undergraduate degree, nor will a neophyte really

be left to learn to teach after he has been certified and is out on the job. An extended program with several levels of preprofessional experience prior to final certification will insure that only the fully prepared teacher will be certified. The total program may take as long as eight years, including the undergraduate degree, and terminate in a master's degree which reflects teaching ability in a special area.

APPENDIX A

TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM INVENTORY

This will be used to make comparisons among several teacher preparation programs. Please do not write your name on these sheets. Answer honestly, considering the program as a whole rather than isolated incidents. This solicits your reactions and is not a test.

DIRECTIONS: Fill in only date, age and sex at the top of the answer sheet. Read the directions on the answer sheet and examine the sample answer block directly below the directions.

On this sheet there are a number of questions to be answered on a scale of A to E. Place your choice on the answer sheet. Note that the questions are numbered horizontally on the answer sheet. Please be careful not to fold or bend the top edge of the answer sheet. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

I believe professional teacher preparation as I have experienced it is:

1.	valuable	A	B	C	D	E	worthless
2.	hard	A	B	C	D	E	easy
3.	idealistic	A	B	C	D	E	practical
4.	relevant	A	B	C	D	E	irrelevant
5.	efficient	A	B	C	D	E	inefficient

On the basis of my experience I believe pupils to be:

6.	interesting	A	B	C	D	E	boring
7.	able	A	B	C	D	E	helpless
8.	pampered	A	B	C	D	E	deprived
9.	spontaneous	A	B	C	D	E	inhibited
10.	similar	A	B	C	D	E	different

On the basis of my experience I believe schools are:

11.	baby sitting agencies	A	B	C	D	E	learning agencies
12.	hopeless	A	B	C	D	E	hope filled
13.	depressing	A	B	C	D	E	exhilarating
14.	relevant	A	B	C	D	E	irrelevant
15.	efficient	A	B	C	D	E	inefficient

Personally, I look upon teaching as:

16.	a profession	A	B	C	D	E	a job
17.	individualized	A	B	C	D	E	grouped
18.	pupil centered	A	B	C	D	E	subject centered
19.	direct	A	B	C	D	E	indirect
20.	teacher centered	A	B	C	D	E	pupil centered

Use the scale below for items 21-30.

I feel I know	(much	A	B	C	D	E	little) about:
21.	grouping	A	B	C	D	E	
22.	school environment	A	B	C	D	E	
23.	teacher duties	A	B	C	D	E	
24.	disadvantaged pupils	A	B	C	D	E	
25.	agencies for disadvantaged pupils	A	B	C	D	E	
26.	differentiated assignment	A	B	C	D	E	

27.	team teaching	A	B	C	D	E
28.	lesson preparation	A	B	C	D	E
29.	discipline	A	B	C	D	E
30.	testing and evaluation	A	B	C	D	E

(A) strong agreement, (B) agreement, (C) disagreement, (D) strong disagreement

31. A B C D The theoretical purpose of the Cherry Creek program--practical experience--was an appropriate activity for the beginning of the program.

32. A B C D The University and public schools can cooperate to produce better teacher programs.

33. A B C D The teaching experience was of no more value than a methods course alone would have been.

34. A B C D Too much time was devoted to this teacher education activity.

35. A B C D I feel more able to approach the staff of the University as a result of the program.

36. A B C D As a result of the teacher education experience, I have less fear of failure in the practical side of teaching.

37. A B C D I found the whole experience uncomfortable.

38. A B C D Theoretical courses have become meaningful as a result of my public school participation.

39. A B C D My experience in the schools was as expected.

40. A B C D I was surprised to learn how little diversity of opinion and attitude exists among teachers.

41. A B C D Similar programs would be valuable for all future teachers.

42. A B C D My relations with the public school cooperating teacher were rewarding.

43. A B C D Travel was a major problem.

44. A B C D Isolation from the University faculty and facilities was a detriment.

45. A B C D I really missed the extra-curricular activities of the campus.

APPENDIX B

STUDENT ATTITUDE SCALE

Directions to Students

A study is being made to determine the attitude of secondary school students toward their student teachers. You are being asked to help in this study by responding to the 65 items on the Student Attitude Scale which is attached.

It is important that you consider your entire school experience in marking your answers which do not deal specifically with your student teacher. In those dealing with your student teacher, try to answer specifically in terms of your relationship with that student teacher and no other teachers.

An answer sheet is provided on which you are asked to mark responses. The following is an example of the kind of thing you will be asked to respond to:

Examples

1. I feel that my student teacher is genuinely concerned about me and my success in school.

1. Agree Disagree
   0 0

If you agree with the above statement, blacken the circle under Agree. If you disagree with it, blacken the space under Disagree.

2. I generally do an acceptable job of studying.

2. Agree Disagree
   0 0

Again, if you agree with the above statement, blacken the circle under Agree. If you disagree with it, blacken the circle under Disagree.

REMEMBER: In questions like example 1, concentrate specifically on YOUR student teacher. In questions like example 2, think of your entire school experience.

Please answer every item. Your first reaction is generally the best (your true feeling); therefore, do not spend a lot of time on any one item. Completely blacken the space for each answer. Please use a pencil. DO NOT use a ball-point pen. If you do not have a pencil, ask for one.

Answers to this scale will not be used to make individual comparisons or evaluations; in fact, we ask you specifically NOT to place your name on the answer sheet. Please express yourself frankly and honestly, knowing that how you as an individual answered the items will never be known to anyone other than you.

Thank you for your cooperation.

STUDENT ATTITUDE SCALE

1. I generally do an acceptable job of studying.
2. I think school work is important.
3. My student teacher is concerned about whether or not a student has friends.
4. Students are given enough freedom in selecting their school subjects.
5. Students in my school make a special effort to make new students feel welcome.
6. I can depend on my student teacher to help me even if I should get into serious trouble.
7. I feel that my student teacher is definitely interested in me as an individual.
8. I understand the reasons behind school rules and regulations.
9. I feel that my student teacher cares about what students think about their subjects, their classroom work, and their assignments.
10. I do as well as my classmates in school.
11. My grades tend to encourage me in my school work.
12. The school has the information I want and need to know about colleges or other schools which offer post-high school education.
13. My student teacher has talked with me about the things I do best.
14. I feel at ease when talking individually to my student teacher.
15. Students in my school do not make fun of other students who are different.
16. When I am in a "rut" in school, I know how to get out of it.
17. My student teacher has done something important especially for me as an individual.
18. My student teacher shows respect and consideration for students under his (her) supervision.
19. I feel free to discuss a personal problem with my student teacher.

20. It is easy for me to make friends.

21. The grading system is an incentive to do my best work.

22. My student teacher is aware of the opinions of his (her) students.

23. Time spent in school is worthwhile.

24. To be accepted by a group of friends is one of the best things that can happen to a person.

25. My student teacher speaks to me outside of class.

26. I feel that I have become sufficiently involved in school activities.

27. I can talk about my real feelings about things with my student teacher.

28. Most high school students are interested in helping other students succeed.

29. I usually feel comfortable and at ease when I am in classes taught by my student teacher.

30. I seldom think about quitting school.

31. I put school work before other things.

32. My student teacher lets me know when I have done a good job.

33. I have several close friends at school who would stick by me even if I were in serious trouble.

34. My student teacher has helped me to make new friends.

35. My student teacher understands the problems of high school students.

36. My friends think that getting good grades in school is important.

37. Most students respect my student teacher.

38. My student teacher tries to become personally acquainted with all the students in his (her) classes.

39. I spend enough time studying.

40. I have a friend whom I can trust to keep my secrets.

41. My student teacher misses me when I am absent from class.

42. My school subjects interest me.

43. Making friends at school is easy.

44. My student teacher makes an effort to make new students feel welcome at school.

45. My student teacher thinks that I will be successful in my adult life.

46. My student teacher tries to give students a chance to be successful in class.

47. I look forward to seeing my friends at school.

48. I like the subject which my student teacher teaches.

49. My student teacher is more likely to recognize students when they have done a good job than to criticize them for their shortcomings.

50. I feel that I can <u>really</u> talk with my student teacher.

51. School work is easy for me.

52. My student teacher has helped me feel more confident about my ability.

53. I work to learn in school.

54. I enjoy doing school work.

55. I want to keep my grades about the same as those of the rest of the members of my group.

56. School work is exciting and interesting for me.

57. My student teacher helps me with any problems or questions I have.

58. My student teacher is willing to spend extra time and effort to help me.

59. I enjoy coming to school.

60. I hate to miss school.

61. I would be going to school whether or not I had to.

62. I think my student teacher enjoys teaching.

63. My education is helping me to set and achieve my future goals.

64. It is easy for me to get along with my student teacher.

65. I find it easy to talk with my student teacher about my problems.

APPENDIX C

REPORT FORM--COOPERATING TEACHER

Please complete the following questions as soon as possible and as completely and carefully as you can. The information will be used for comparisons with one of our other systems for teacher preparation. At no point will this be used to evaluate you or your student teacher. This will not be entered into any records. Do not sign the form. It is coded so I know who has responded for follow up purposes or to ask questions if I am unable to understand your responses.

Please understand it is your beliefs, feelings and opinions I need. I hope you do not need to consult fellow teachers, administrators or your student teacher in completing this form. Please keep your rating in strict confidence. It will only be used in forming some group statistics. Please understand I trust you to give me an honest report. I hope you will trust me to be honest and candid in the summary. I have no connection with the study except its evaluation.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. Please return this in the enclosed envelope.

Harold M. Anderson
Hellems Annex 112, University of Colorado

COOPERATING TEACHER RATING

Please rate your student teacher on this form. Make your comparison with respect to all certified teachers as you know them. This report will only be used for research purposes and will not be used to recommend or grade students. As stated before, we want your opinion.

Concern for pupil welfare	very low	1	2	3	4	5	very high
Desire to improve	very low	1	2	3	4	5	very high
Ability to organize for teaching duties	very low	1	2	3	4	5	very high
Realism of his (her) expectation	very low	1	2	3	4	5	very high
Subject area competence	very low	1	2	3	4	5	very high
Theoretical background in education	very low	1	2	3	4	5	very high
Practical adaptation to teaching	very low	1	2	3	4	5	very high
Quality of work habits	very low	1	2	3	4	5	very high
Present professional ability	very low	1	2	3	4	5	very high
Professional promise	very low	1	2	3	4	5	very high

My prediction for this person as a teacher is:

_____A. Most likely will not teach (give reason).

_____B. Will do rather poorly.

_____C. Will be satisfactory.

_____D. Very good to excellent.

_____E. Superior.

Do you have any comments about this person's preparation or selection?

APPENDIX D

REPORT FROM COOPERATING TEACHERS

Please complete this form as soon as possible and as completely and carefully as you can. It will be used for an evaluation of the Cherry Creek-University of Colorado Teacher Education Project. At no time will it be used to evaluate you or your instructional aid. Do not sign this form. There are identification marks known to me only that will be used to follow up on unreturned measures or to ask questions if I do not believe I understand your responses.

Please understand it is your beliefs, feelings and opinions we want. We hope you do not feel any need to consult fellow teachers, administrators or your instructional aids to complete this form. Above all be assured that this information will be kept in strict confidence and reported only as group statistics after compilation. I trust you to give me an honest report; I hope you will trust me to be honest and candid in my evaluation. I have no connection with the project other than its evaluation.

If you have any other information or data that you believe I should have, please feel free to write on the reverse side of the instrument or send a separate letter or even call me.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Harold M. Anderson
Hellems Annex 112
University of Colorado

I. Project Operations

Please indicate your views on the questions here by making a check mark. On a number of these items we want an amplified answer if you are inclined to give it. The last pages of this instrument are left for you to express ideas. Please identify your comments with the question number so that I am certain what you refer to.

1. Do you favor continuation of the project? definitely not 1 2 3 4 5 yes
2. How well were you able to communicate with university personnel? not at all 1 2 3 4 5 excellently
3. How well were you able to communicate with the local project director (Mr. Schmidt)? not at all 1 2 3 4 5 excellently
4. How would you rate the cooperation from university personnel? poor 1 2 3 4 5 excellent

5. How do you rate the cooperation from the local director (Schmidt)? poor 1 2 3 4 5 excellent

6. How efficiently has your instructional aid been used to help in instruction? inefficiently 1 2 3 4 5 efficiently

7. How efficiently is the project helping your instructional aid learning to be a professional teacher? inefficiently 1 2 3 4 5 efficiently

8. How adequate are provisions for input from you for policy and operational change (exclude this questionnaire)? poor 1 2 3 4 5 excellent

A. Have you made suggestions? yes ____ no ____
B. If yes, were they accepted? yes ____ no ____
C. If yes, were they implemented? yes ____ no ____

Comments:

9. Was your instructional aid <u>exposed</u> to enough varieties of instruction? no ____ yes ____ yes, with qualifications___

A. If no or yes, with qualifications--explain:

10. Could the time required in experience as an instructional aid be reduced? no ____ Yes ____ Yes, with qualifications___

A. If yes--state how:

II. Cooperating Teacher Rating

Please rate your instructional aid on this form. Make your comparison with respect to all certified teachers as you know them. This report will only be used for research purposes and will <u>not</u> be used to recommend or grade students. As stated before we want <u>your</u> opinion.

Concern for pupil welfare very low 1 2 3 4 5 very high
Desire to improve very low 1 2 3 4 5 very high

Ability to organize for teaching duties	very low 1 2 3 4 5 very high
Realism of his (her) expectation	very low 1 2 3 4 5 very high
Subject area competence	very low 1 2 3 4 5 very high
Theoretical background in education	very low 1 2 3 4 5 very high
Practical adaptation to teaching	very low 1 2 3 4 5 very high
Quality of work habits	very low 1 2 3 4 5 very high
Present professional ability	very low 1 2 3 4 5 very high
Professional promise	very low 1 2 3 4 5 very high

My prediction for this person as a teacher is:

_____A. Most likely will not teach (give reason).

_____B. Will do rather poorly.
_____C. Will be satisfactory.
_____D. Very good to excellent.
_____E. Superior.

Do you have any comments about this person's preparation or selection?

APPENDIX E

INSTRUCTIONAL AID SELF-REPORT--SENIORS

I am collecting this information as an evaluation of the Cherry Creek-C.U. Teacher Education Project. In asking you to fill this out, I am imposing on your time and good nature. I do so because your reactions are important to me in making recommendations about the future of the program. Please be aware I want your views, beliefs, feelings and factual reports only for evaluating the program. This will not be used to evaluate you, your cooperating teacher or other individuals. There is no threat or benefit to you. I hope the results will affect the teacher preparation programs of future students. Please give your honest reaction. I must trust you to do so. I ask you to trust me to handle the data confidentially and with integrity.

Please do not sign the forms. I have them coded for my use.

If there are other items you would like presented besides the points I ask about here please write them out at the end. Thank you.

Harold M. Anderson
Hellems Annex 112
University of Colorado

Self-rating

1. Which response best describes your readiness to assume professional teaching responsibilities next fall?

____a. I don't intend to teach (give brief reason).

____b. I'm scared every time I think of it.
____c. I'm just a little apprehensive.
____d. I believe I'm ready.
____e. I'm looking forward to the opportunity.

2. How do you rate your growth for teaching during this year?

____a. I did not grow.
____b. Quite small--minimal.
____c. About as expected.
____d. Really was a great experience.

3. My experiences with different teaching environments this year was:

____a. Too narrow in scope or too poor.
____b. Quite broad but not very beneficial.
____c. Rather limited in scope but very beneficial.
____d. Very good in scope and quality.

4. I felt my learning of different teaching methods was:

____a. Limited in scope.
____b. Limited in application.
____c. Satisfactory.
____d. Extremely beneficial to me.

5. During my preparation for teaching, my experience with pupils of different age levels was:

____a. Too limited.
____b. About right.
____c. Too diverse.

6. In my opinion my freedom to plan and try out new things in classes was:

____a. Too restricted.
____b. About right.
____c. Too lenient.

7. In my opinion the teaching models provided by my cooperating teachers or teams were:

____a. Inadequate.
____b. Satisfactory.
____c. Excellent.

8. How satisfactory has your preparation for teaching been with respect to good test construction and grading procedures?

____a. It's missing.
____b. Inadequate.
____c. Satisfactory.
____d. Really very good.

9. How do you rate your ability to use various visual aids (overhead, film and filmstrip projector, etc.)?

____a. Poor. ____b. Fair ____c. Good. ____d. Excellent

10. How well do you like school pupils?

___a. Ugh. ___b. Fair. ___c. Pretty well. ___d. They're great.

The remaining questions have space provided for you to expand on your answers. Be assured that I am very much interested in your constructive criticisms, ideas and suggestions.

11. How beneficial are the seminar meetings?

___a. Very poor. ___b. Fair. ___c. Good. ___d. Excellent.

Suggestions for improvement:

12. How do you rate the field trip to IBM and similar places?

___a. Poor. ___b. Fair. ___c. Good. ___d. Excellent

Suggestions:

13. Have the University and public schools fulfilled all their promises to you?

___a. Yes. ___b. No.

If no, please explain:

14. If you could get a teaching position any place you wished, which would you choose?

_____a. Adams City.
_____b. Cherry Creek.
_____c. Denver.
_____d. Other in state.
_____e. Out of state.

If d. or e., state where:_____. What was the reason for your choice?

15. (Secondary--use first three lines below; elementary--use last three lines.) State which of the categories best describes your rating of courses. In the space following please give comments and suggestions for improvement.

307 _____a. Poor.
308 _____b. Fair.
Special Methods _____c. Good.
_____d. Excellent.

Elementary Science
Language Arts
Social Studies

Comments:

16. (Elementary--go to item 18.) Secondary students--How do you rate your experience with the special reading program?

____a. Poor. ____b. Fair. ____c. Good. ____d. Excellent

Comments and suggestions:

17. Secondary only--During the last part of this semester you have had a choice of several kinds of independent work. Please describe for me what you did and point out its values. If you have suggestions for its improvement, please be specific.

18. Please give me <u>your</u> opinion regarding the services you performed for the district in earning pay and the concomitant pre-professional preparation. While I do not wish to restrict your comments please answer these questions especially.

    a. Did you earn your salary? Were you exploited?
    b. What could be done to improve the Cherry Creek-C.U. project? How could it be more efficient? Could your junior and senior years be condensed to two or three semesters? (This last question does not apply to elementary.)

APPENDIX F

TEACHER STATUS REPORT

PRESENT POSITION

NAME | ADDRESS: STREET, CITY AND ZONE | TELEPHONE

1. CERTIFIED: Type and Where

2. TEACHING: Where -- what -- level

3. GRADUATE WORK: Type of Program

Degree: M.A._____ Ph.D._____ Other_____

4. If you dropped out of the program, tell us why.

5. If you completed the program tell us what motivated you to stay.

* * * * * * * *

QUESTIONNAIRE

Definition of terms: 1) I.A. -- An Instructional Assistant was a 1st or 2nd year student in the Project
2) Intern -- An Intern was a 3rd year student in the Project

Circle the word letter that best describes your feeling:
(A) Strong agreement, (B) Agreement, (C) Disagreement,
(D) Strong disagreement (E) Not applicable

1. A B C D E Starting as I.A.'s in the schools was an appropriate activity for the beginning of the Project.

2. A B C D E Five years was too long for the program.

3. A B C D E Participation in the program made me more able to approach faculty members.

4. A B C D E As a result of the teacher education experience, I had less fear of failure in the practical side of teaching.

5. A B C D E I found the whole experience uncomfortable.

6. A B C D E Theoretical courses taught on site at the school district were meaningful.

7. A B C D E My experience in the schools met my expectations.

8. A B C D E Similar programs would be valuable for most future teachers.

9. A B C D E My relations with teachers in the project were rewarding.

10. A B C D E As an I.A., travel to the public school was a major problem.

11. A B C D E As an Intern, travel to the public school was a major problem.

12. A B C D E Isolation from the university faculty and facilities was a detriment.

13. A B C D E I really missed the extracurricular activities of the campus.

14. A B C D E The selection process for the project, which involved interviews with Cherry Creek teachers and staff was a good approach.

15. A B C D E The inclusion of Cherry Creek teachers and staff members in the teaching of professional education courses was an important part of the program.

16. A B C D E Visits to educational agencies and institutions such as the Air Force Academy, Jeffco Outdoor Lab and United Airlines were worth the time taken away from regular classroom assignments.

17. A B C D E My role as an I.A. in the Cherry Creek differentiated staffing pattern was well defined.

18. A B C D E My role as an Intern in the Cherry Creek differentiated staffing pattern was well defined.

19. A B C D E My understanding of "what I was getting into" was as good as could be expected of a beginner.

20. A B C D E The time spent in school districts other than Cherry Creek as an I.A. was valuable.

21. A B C D E The ability to earn money while still in training was the primary purpose for my entrance into the Project.

22. A B C D E Having two years of experience in Cherry Creek helped me in being considered for a job in the district.

23. A B C D E Completion of the program made it easier for me to obtain a teaching job than those students who completed the traditional four-year program.

24. A B C D E The time spent at other grade levels than the one at which I planned to teach was valuable.

25. A B C D E In-service education through workshops, regular course work and other professional growth activities should be continued the year after the internship.

26. A B C D E The relationships developed between teachers and interns were helpful.

27. A B C D E The relationships I developed with school district administrators were helpful.

28. A B C D E The tempering of the "reality shock" by entering the profession through the Instructional Assistant-Intern route was helpful.

29. A B C D E Cherry Creek School personnel were interested in my thinking about the project.

30. A B C D E University faculty members were interested in my thinking about the Project.

31. A B C D E The Program was sufficiently flexible to meet my individual needs.

32. A B C D E The payment for my services as an I.A. was adequate.

33. A B C D E The payment for my services as an Intern was adequate.

34. A B C D E When I entered the program, I understood the provisions under which I would be paid.

35. A B C D E I felt secure in terms of the way teachers with whom I worked interpreted my job as an I.A.

36. A B C D E I felt secure in terms of the way teachers with whom I worked interpreted my job as an Intern.

* * * * * *

What do you regard as the major strengths of the program?

What do you believe are weaknesses of the program?

What suggestions would you make to improve the program?